

reference collection book



kansas city
public library
kansas city,
missouri



From the collection of the

j y f d
x z n m k
o PreLinger a h
u v q g Library
e b t s w p c

San Francisco, California
2006

SEP 11 1967

**AMERICAN PLANNING
AND CIVIC ANNUAL**



*Scenes of mirrored beauty in Louisville's Seneca Park
invite rest and relaxation*

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL

A RECORD OF CIVIC ADVANCE IN THE FIELDS OF PLANNING, PARKS, HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE NATIONAL CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON PARKS AND OPEN SPACES, OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION, ACTING WITH THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PARK EXECUTIVES, COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS, AND OTHER CO-OPERATING SPONSORS, HELD AT WASHINGTON, D. C. MAY 22-25, 1955, AND ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE 25TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS, HELD AT STOWE, VERMONT, SEPTEMBER 25-29, 1955, INCLUDING THE ROLL CALL OF THE STATES.

EDITED BY
HARLEAN JAMES

AMERICAN PLANNING AND
CIVIC ASSOCIATION
901 UNION TRUST BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1955

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL is sent out to all paid members and subscribers of the AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION and the NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS, who may purchase extra copies for \$2 each.

The public may purchase past American Planning and Civic Annuals and the current Annual for \$3 each.

A complete set of the American Planning and Civic Annuals, with the exception of the 1948-49 volume, which is now out of print, (18 volumes) may be purchased for \$32.

Mount Pleasant Press
J. HORACE MCFARLAND CO.
Harrisburg, Pa.

352
AS
1955

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

PAST PRESIDENTS

J. HORACE MCFARLAND

FREDERIC A. DELANO

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, New York, N. Y., *Chairman of the Board*
U. S. GRANT 3RD, Washington, D. C., *President*
HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW, St. Louis, Mo., *First Vice-President*
TOM WALLACE, Louisville, Ky., *Second Vice-President*
CARL FEISS, Washington, D. C., *Third Vice-President*
C. F. JACOBSEN, Washington, D. C., *Treasurer*
HARLEAN JAMES, Washington, D. C., *Executive Secretary*
FLAVEL SHURTLEFF, Marshfield Hills, Mass., *Counsel*
MRS. DORA A. PADGETT, Washington, D. C., *Librarian*

FREDERICK J. ADAMS, Cambridge, Mass.
RUSSELL VAN NEST BLACK, New Hope,
Pa.

T. LEDYARD BLAKEMAN, Detroit, Mich.

DAVID D. BOHANNON, San Mateo, Calif.

WILLIAM S. BONNER, Fayetteville, Ark.

DANIEL H. BURNHAM, Chicago, Ill.

PAUL CARRINGTON, Dallas, Tex.

MRS. LEROY CLARK, Englewood, N. J.

GRADY CLAY, Louisville, Ky.

WILLIAM M. COTTON, Dayton, O.

E. J. CONDON, Chicago, Ill.

STUART W. CRAMER, JR., Charlotte, N. C.

JOHN S. DETLIE, Seattle, Wash.

MALCOLM H. DILL, Towson, Md.

MYRON D. DOWNS, Cincinnati, Ohio

CHARLES W. ELIOT 2D, Cambridge, Mass.

HOWARD T. FISHER, Chicago, Ill.

MRS. PAUL GALLAGHER, Omaha, Neb.

MRS. GEORGE A. GARRETT, Washington,
D. C.

S. HERBERT HARE, Kansas City, Mo.

BYRON HARVEY, JR., Chicago, Ill.

MRS. E. NEWLANDS JOHNSTON, Washing-
ton, D. C.

KARL KAMRATH, Houston, Texas

HAROLD M. LEWIS, New York, N. Y.

JOHN GAW MEEM, Santa Fe, N. M.

HOWARD K. MENHINICK, Atlanta, Ga.

DELESSEPS S. MORRISON, New Orleans,
La.

CLYDE NICHOLS, JR., Kansas City, Mo.

C. MCKIM NORTON, New York, N. Y.

CHARLES F. PALMER, Atlanta, Ga.

JOSEPH PRENDERGAST, New York, N. Y.

LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER, New York,
N. Y.

J. WOODALL RODGERS, Dallas, Texas.

ARTHUR RUBLOFF, Chicago, Ill.

C. MELVIN SHARPE, Washington, D. C.

JAMES F. SULZBY, JR., Birmingham, Ala.

FRED W. TUEMMER, Hyattsville, Md.

C. EDGAR VAN CLEEF, JR., Oklahoma
City, Okla.

SAMUEL P. WETHERILL, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

CARL I. WHEAT, Menlo Park, Calif.

GORDON WHITNALL, Los Angeles, Calif.

H. O. WHITTEMORE, Ann Arbor, Mich.

SAM B. ZISMAN, San Antonio, Texas

The purpose of the AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION is the education of the American people to an understanding and appreciation of local, state, regional and national planning for the best use of urban and rural land, and of water and other natural resources; the safeguarding and planned use of local and national parks; the conservation of natural scenery; the improvement of living conditions and the fostering of wider educational facilities in schools and colleges in the fields of planning and conservation.

KANSAS CITY (MO.) PUBLIC LIBRARY

Ref.

6706216

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

TOM WALLACE, Kentucky, *Chairman of the Board*
KENNETH R. COUGILL, Indiana, *President*
ARTHUR C. ELMER, Michigan, *Vice-President*
BEN H. THOMPSON, D. C., *Vice-President*
C. F. JACOBSEN, D. C., *Treasurer*
HARLEAN JAMES, D. C., *Executive Secretary*
MRS. DORA A. PADGETT, D. C., *Editor*

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT, New York
ERNEST E. ALLEN, Kansas
C. H. ARMSTRONG, Oregon
HOWARD W. BAKER, Nebraska
DR. LAURIE D. COX, New Hampshire
CHARLES A. DETURK, Washington
HAROLD J. DYER, Maine
JAMES F. EVANS, New York
V. W. FLICKINGER, Ohio
EARL P. HANSON, California
WILLIAM M. HAYS, Georgia
U. W. HELLA, Minnesota
CLINTON G. JOHNSON, Kentucky

JOSEPH F. KAYLOR, Maryland
HAROLD W. LATHROP, Colorado
PERRY H. MERRILL, Vermont
RAYMOND R. MITCHELL, Iowa
THOMAS W. MORSE, North Carolina
A. NEWTON MOYE, Georgia
FRANK D. QUINN, Texas
LEWIS G. SCOGGIN, Florida
JAMES L. SEGREST, Alabama
JOHN R. VANDERZICHT, Washington
HAROLD S. WAGNER, Ohio
HENRY WARD, D. C.
WILLIAM W. WELLS, Louisiana
CONRAD L. WIRTH, D. C.

The purpose of the NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS is to inform the public through a central clearing house of information, publications, conferences and by other educational means, of the value of state parks, monuments, historic sites and other types of areas suitable for recreation, study of history and cultural resources through establishment and operation of well balanced state park systems, to the end that every citizen of the United States shall have easy access to state recreation areas and appreciate their value; and to encourage adequate state park agencies and programs, including the establishment of civil service policies and standards of selection, development and administration.

The two organizations join in the publication of the
AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL
and the
QUARTERLY, PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT

CONTENTS

Frontispiece		PAGE
Preface		ix
THE NATION		
An Adequate National Park System for 300 Million People	<i>Conrad L. Wirth</i>	1
Recreational Use of the National Forests	<i>Richard McArdle</i>	8
The Need for Wilderness Areas	<i>Howard Zahnizer</i>	14
Wildlife Resources and their Protection	<i>Ira N. Gabrielson</i>	24
Discussion	<i>Fred M. Packard</i>	30
Service of the National Parks	<i>Hon. Douglas McKay</i>	31
Tribute to National Parks	<i>Bradley H. Patterson</i>	32
Importance of National Parks	<i>Sen. Harry F. Byrd</i>	33
The Record of Congress in Protecting our National Parks	<i>Rep. John P. Saylor</i>	37
IN THE STATES		
Presented at National Conference on State Parks, Stowe, Vt. September 25-29, 1955		
Safety Programs for State Parks	<i>Polk Hebert</i>	41
National Forests and Recreation in the Northeast	<i>Gerald S. Wheeler</i>	46
Design Problems—Artificial Bathing Areas	<i>L. L. Huttleston</i>	51
	<i>John I. Rogers</i>	52
Comments on Camping in State Parks	<i>C. L. Harrington</i>	53
	<i>C. P. Bradford</i>	54
Super Highways and Parks	<i>Joseph F. Kaylor</i>	57
Roll Call of the States		
Alabama	<i>James L. Segrest</i>	58
California	<i>Earl P. Hanson</i>	59
Connecticut	<i>Donald C. Mathews</i>	61
Florida	<i>Elmer L. Hill</i>	62
Georgia	<i>William H. Hay</i>	63
Indiana	<i>K. R. Cougill</i>	63
Iowa	<i>Wilbur A. Rush</i>	65
Kentucky	<i>Henry Ward</i>	66
Otter Creek Park	<i>Clinton G. Johnson</i>	67
Louisiana	<i>William W. Wells</i>	67
Maine	<i>Harold J. Dyer</i>	68
Maryland	<i>Joseph F. Kaylor</i>	69
Massachusetts	<i>Raymond J. Kenney</i>	70
Michigan	<i>Arthur C. Elmer</i>	71
Minnesota	<i>U. W. Hella</i>	72
Missouri	<i>Austin Houston</i>	74
Montana	<i>Ashley C. Roberts</i>	74
New Hampshire	<i>Russell B. Tobey</i>	75
New Jersey	<i>Joseph E. McLean</i>	76
New Mexico	<i>Carl A. Freeman</i>	76
New York	<i>James F. Evans</i>	77
North Carolina	<i>Thomas W. Morse</i>	78

	Page
Ohio	<i>V. W. Flickinger</i> 79
Ohio Historical Society	<i>Richard S. Fatig</i> 81
Oklahoma	<i>Ernest E. Allen</i> 81
Oregon	<i>C. H. Armstrong</i> 82
Pennsylvania	<i>W. P. Moll</i> 83
Rhode Island	<i>Wm. H. Cotter, Jr.</i> 84
Texas	<i>Gordon K. Shearer</i> 85
Vermont	<i>Robert G. Simon</i> 86
Washington	<i>J. R. Vanderzicht</i> 86
West Virginia	<i>H. M. Harr</i> 87
Wisconsin	<i>C. L. Harrington</i> 88
Presented at the National Citizens Conference on Parks and Open Spaces by the American Planning and Civic Assoc- iation and cooperating groups, Washington, D. C. May 22- 25, 1955. Establishment and Protection of State Parks	<i>V. W. Flickinger</i> 90
State Control of Roadside Vegetation	<i>David R. Levin</i> 97
Roadsides and the Federal Highway System	<i>Burton W. Marsh</i> 103
Discussion	<i>Thomas W. Morse</i> 112
IN THE CITIES AND TOWNS	
PARKS AND OPEN SPACES	
What Parks and Open Spaces Mean to the American People	<i>Joseph Prendergast</i> 114
The Disappearing Countryside	<i>C. McKim Norton</i> 120
Our Federal City Parks	<i>Gilmore D. Clarke</i> 123
Metropolitan Planning for Parks and Open Spaces	<i>T. Ledyard Blakeman</i> 129
Enrichment of Living	<i>Sterling S. Winans</i> 133
Colloquium: What Can People Do About Parks and Open Spaces	<i>Frederick Gulheim</i> 138
	<i>Mrs. LeRoy Clark</i> 138
	<i>Grady Clay</i> 139
	<i>George C. Hayward</i> 144
	<i>James McClain</i> 150
Parks Preservation Clinic	<i>Harry Alexander</i> 154
	<i>Milo F. Christiansen</i> 155
	<i>George E. Dickie</i> 157
NEEDS OF OUR GROWING POPULATION	
Space for Our Congested Cities	<i>Carl Feiss</i> 157
Advance and Retreat of Metropolitan Park Building	<i>H. O. Whillemore</i> 162
Town and County Forests	<i>Roland F. Eisenbeis</i> 165
Discussion	<i>Earl Von Storch</i> 170
	<i>Perry L. Norton</i> 172
Central Park, New York	<i>Stuart Constable</i> 174
Our Perpetual (?) Temporaries	<i>Rudolph Kauffman II</i> 180
ZONING ROUND TABLE	<i>Flavel Shurtleff, Chairman</i> 186
CONFERENCE CONCLUSIONS	<i>Tom Wallace, Chairman</i> 190

Preface

THE PUBLICATION OF THE 1955 AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL has been delayed, but it is our belief that most of the material prepared by eminent speakers for the Washington National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces and for the 35th Annual Meeting of the National Conference on State Parks, has a lasting value beyond the day of delivery, and we, therefore, commend to our readers' attention the factual accounts and philosophy of the planning and conservation problems with which the United States is now confronted.

The section on the Nation presents a New Program for National Parks and National Forests by Directors Wirth and McArdle, recognition of the value of national parks by the Secretary of the Interior, the President's Cabinet and Congress, through Senator Harry F. Byrd and Representative John Saylor. Wilderness and Wildlife Resources are discussed by Dr. Ira Gabrielson and Howard Zahnizer.

State Parks were considered at the Washington Conference on Parks and Open Spaces in May and at the Vermont National Conference on State Parks in September 1955. The Roll Call of the States takes up the story from where the 1954 AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL left off, and the story will be continued in the 1956 ANNUAL to be issued early in 1957. Articles on state parks in relation to safety, design and facilities are presented. Standards for selection of state parks are outlined by V. W. Flickinger. State control of roadside vegetation is outlined by David Levin of the Public Roads Bureau, and the importance of the new Federal Highway Systems is presented by Burton W. Marsh of the American Automobile Association.

In addition to the papers presented by the distinguished speakers at the Conference on Parks and Open Spaces, we circularized the urban planning agencies to ascertain, if we could, how many city planning commissions had what they considered an adequate comprehensive plan for parks, either for the city or the metropolitan region. Not all of the cities to which we wrote gave us the information; but it is significant that not one city could claim that its park plans were adequate for the future needs. As we have secured information concerning areas all over the United States, we are convinced that one of the most important steps in making urban regions into good living environments is for planning commissions to study their parks and open spaces and make plans for securing essential areas before our growing populations have already caused congestion beyond hope of actual acquisition of areas acknowledged to be needed.

It is our hope that those who read the articles presented in this ANNUAL will study their home neighborhoods and give support to their planning agencies when they make comprehensive plans for parks and open spaces. There is need for state, regional and city action in this field.

In addition to the American Institute of Park Executives, Council of Metropolitan Regional Organizations, National Recreation Association and the National Conference on State Parks which joined with the American Planning and Civic Association in the call of the Conference on Parks and Open Spaces, the following acted as cooperating sponsors: American Automobile Association, American Institute of Planners, American Nature Association, American Recreation Society, American Society of Landscape Architects, Friends of the Land, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., National Association of Travel Organizations, National Audubon Society, National Parks Association, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Nature Conservancy, North American Wildlife Foundation, Wilderness Society, and Wildlife Management Institute.

With all of these organizations on the alert, a well defined public opinion should be available to planning agencies which wish to adopt comprehensive plans for parks and open spaces.

HARLEAN JAMES, *Editor*

December, 1956

THE NATION*

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

An Adequate National Park System for 300 Million People

CONRAD L. WIRTH, Director National Park Service,
Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

I AM glad to meet with this group today—to be among the friends with whom I have been associated for many years in the fields of planning and conservation of parks and other recreation areas.

When Miss James asked me to talk about “An Adequate National Park System for 300 Million People”, I accepted the opportunity willingly but not lightly. For that is a formidable subject with which the National Park Service is generally, and I am personally, very much concerned.

We started last fall to take stock of ourselves—trying to analyze our problems and faults, and we have been trying especially to foresee what lies ahead for the American people in the way of their being able to continue to enjoy the national parks and monuments and wholesome outdoor recreation in related types of areas.

First, we might well look at our growing population and park attendance. Last year, out of the 165 million people who live in the United States, 48 million visits were made to areas administered by the National Park Service. We had a hard time supplying services to these millions—housing and camping facilities, roads, and interpretive services were pressed to the utmost in meeting their needs. And we did not, as many of you know, despite our best efforts, meet all demands.

But let us take a look into the future. Suppose the parks had to serve a population of 300 million people instead of 165 million! The Census Bureau has estimated that in ten years there may be almost 190 million people in the United States, and by 1975 the population may be over 200 million. If the population continues to grow at the present rate, we will have more than 300 million people in the year 2000—only 45 years from now.

How many of the 300 million will be visitors to the areas of the National Park System? Last year the ratio of park visitors to the population of the United States was close to 1 to 3. Assuming that that ratio holds steady the areas would be hosts to more than 88 million visitors in the year 2000. But we know from experience that the actual number of visitors is apt to be higher than that, as they have been increasing at a much faster rate than the population. In 1916 the ratio of

*All of the papers in this section were delivered at the National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People, held in Washington, D. C. May 22-25, 1955.

visitors to population was 1-300, in 1920 it was 1-100 and in 1954 it was down to about 1 to 3.

Should we be concerned today with the demands that the 300 million people in a future generation will make on the National Park System? I think it is clear that we should. In the midst of our concern about meeting current problems and providing for the enjoyment of the parks this year and next year, we cannot forget the basic concept set forth by the Congress when the National Park Service was established—namely, that the parks, monuments, and related reservations are also to be preserved for the enjoyment of *future generations*. And by the same mandate they are to be preserved *unimpaired*. Therein lies the problem.

For a number of years, there was a lag in providing the facilities and services needed to preserve and protect the park areas and to present them with pride to those fortunate enough to visit them. At the same time, the parks were overwhelmed with an increasing flood of visitors. The result was to place our Nation's heritage of irreplaceable scenic and historic areas in danger of being *loved to death*. The facilities of today are only adequate to carry the load of fifteen years ago when we were planning on 25 million visitors. We have been getting increased appropriations lately but unfortunately much of this additional money has gone to replace facilities that wore out or became obsolete during the emergency period of the war and the years that followed, although recently we have been able to make real progress in new construction and development programs.

The Superintendent of one of our Western parks gave me a good illustration of one of our problems recently. He pointed out that the vast majority of visitors to the park are Californians. But he pointed out further that California's population is increasing at the rate of *8,000 a week*. Automobile registrations are rising at the rate of 2500 a week. And at this rate, he reasons, if we were fortunate enough to obtain funds to carry out all developments and improvements in our present Master Plan, we would still be farther behind in 10 years than we are now in meeting the needs of the public.

But of even greater concern, what will be the result of this impact upon the parks? Must we some day face the fact that parks have a carrying capacity even as a grazing range, and ration their use?

Or will it some day be necessary to preclude overnight use of most of the parks, even for camping, which requires more space per person than other types of overnight accommodations? Or can the problem be met by the dispersal of use areas? In considering these problems we bear in mind that it ought to be the privilege of every American to be able to enjoy the experience of camping in these great outdoor spaces, if that can possibly be arranged without destruction of the things we are trying to preserve.

Only a few months ago, in connection with the development of the Everglades National Park, a policy was established that excluded the construction of overnight accommodations in the new visitor use area at Flamingo on the theory that all of the available land would be needed for day use, and that the private lands outside the park, 30 miles away, might best be used for overnight accommodations. Again in overcrowded park areas, and where additional campgrounds are needed, I am certain that campgrounds on adjoining public lands can be found without too much disturbance to other land management programs.

There are countless other problems with which we are faced, and sometimes an old problem appears in new form. I am thinking of the burning issue which arose only a short generation ago over whether automobiles should be admitted to national parks. For a time road-blocks were actually set up to keep them out. As the number of automobiles increased, the old stage coach roads were paved. These roads led to the most interesting and scenic areas, and while in the stage coach days the relatively few people who visited these areas did very little damage, today, with the thousands of cars and millions of people, great damage is being done. This problem needs careful study.

Now there are the airplane and the helicopter, and each year they are increasing in popularity.

I have never advocated aircraft landing fields in the parks and monuments. In fact, I have urged the Civil Aeronautics Administration to establish minimum altitudes below which aircraft should not fly over the natural areas within the National Park System. But our problem in this respect will continue to grow, especially with the growing popularity and efficiency of the helicopter.

We realize that, to meet the problems of the future, we must adopt a new approach to many of our problems. These approaches of necessity must be different. How different I do not yet know.

As a start toward meeting the national park needs of the year 2000, we are looking toward the year 1966—the year when the National Park Service will celebrate its Golden Anniversary. Our first goal is to solve, by that time, the difficult problem of protecting the scenic and historic areas of the National Park System from overuse and, at the same time, of providing optimum opportunity for public enjoyment of the parks. Our goal for 1966 is a completed and executed plan to handle 75 million visitors. We cannot handle 75 million visitors with facilities designed for 25 million.

We are making an intensive study of the problems of protection, public use, interpretation, development, staffing, legislation, financing, and all other phases of park operation, in order to produce a comprehensive and integrated program of use and protection that is in harmony with the obligations of the National Park Service.

Our *immediate* objective is the development of a dynamic program to be presented for consideration by the Department, the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress beginning with the 1957 fiscal year estimates. The *ultimate* objective is the execution of the program by the time the Service celebrates its Golden Anniversary in 1966.

It is our hope that we can announce this Fall that our program is well under way and can successfully be accomplished—that the parks can be developed and staffed by 1966, so as to provide adequate facilities of all types for the maximum number of visitors consistent with guaranteeing the continued protection and preservation which is our first responsibility. To obtain the approval and support of the Department, Congress, and the public, we must have a sound program. This we fully intend to develop.

A special staff is now at work reviewing the experiences of the past and studying the expectations of the future. It is reviewing and reappraising the guiding policies and principles of the Service. Efforts are being made through personal interviews and correspondence to bring out individual thoughts on the many problems and how some of them might better be solved. Further impetus is being given the project by the establishment of steering committees in each regional office to assist with the undertaking.

In our study, we are still guided by the original national park concept. If our planning is carried on within the framework of that concept, it should be possible to achieve a National Park System that will be adequate to meet the needs of our people ten years from now and to further develop that concept to meet the needs of a population of 300 million people.

To emphasize this point, I might remind you of these three brief yet broad principles which were announced by the Secretary of the Interior 37 years ago. They have never been changed and they are even more important today.

First, that the national parks must be maintained in absolutely unimpaired form for the use of future generations as well as those of our own time;

Second, that they are set apart for the use, observation, health, and pleasure of the people; and

Third, that the national interest must dictate all decisions affecting public or private enterprise in parks.

Finally, we will not overlook our continued efforts to cooperate with the States and to encourage them to carry their share of the increasing load of providing outdoor recreation facilities for our population. The National Park Service will continue and strengthen its cooperation with the States in helping them to provide more adequate State park systems and programs.

Both the States and the Federal Government have responsibilities

in the field of park development, and these responsibilities supplement each other. The preservation of areas with scenic, historic and scientific features of less than national significance is generally accepted as a responsibility of the States and their political sub-divisions. Theirs too is the responsibility for providing adequate outdoor recreation areas and facilities with easy access of all their citizens. In order to provide wholesome outdoor recreation for future generations of picnickers, campers, hikers, and students of nature, a few of the States have been setting aside unspoiled natural and scenic areas close to where the people live, even if development must wait until later. This principle of planning might well have wider application.

An adequate park system to meet the needs of the people now, 10 years from now, or the needs of the 300 million people in the year 2000 does not *just grow*. It has to be planned, step by step, in accordance with certain guiding principles. We have to decide, among other things, what kind of park system we want and what that system should provide—what kind of areas are needed. Should the system be planned to take care of the recreation needs of the country? Should it provide amusement places?

We believe that the National Park System should be comprised of areas of outstanding scenic, natural, and historic significance to the Nation. Each area should possess certain matchless or unique qualities, which entitle it to a position of first rank among areas of its kind, to qualify for preservation by the Federal Government. The System, as a whole, should embrace the broad outlines of our outdoor heritage and of man's career on this continent.

The program for the selection and acquisition of the finest natural and historic areas for inclusion in the National Park System should not be permitted to give way to the selection of areas of poorer quality to build a park system that is adequate in quantity but not in quality.

Neither should the areas of the System be selected because of their accessibility. We believe that areas should be selected because they are of outstanding interest to the people of the Nation as a whole and only on that basis are they considered worthy of the Nation.

Careful analysis of the National Park System indicates that there are types of areas of national significance not adequately represented.

From the standpoint of scenic types, for example, relatively little that is representative of the Great Plains, the North Woods country of the Great Lakes region, or the Mississippi River and its major tributaries, has been included in the System. The majority of the large national parks and monuments are in the West, where they were set apart from the public domain. Aside from Acadia on the coast of Maine, there is no national park to preserve a representative segment of the northeastern part of the Country. The Everglades National Park at the southern tip of Florida, is one representative segment of

the Southeast. The Great Smokies and Shenandoah National Park with their connecting Blue Ridge National Parkway, represent the eastern mountain range.

Neither Acadia nor Everglades was established primarily for its seashore qualities. There is as yet only one area of the National Park System authorized primarily to preserve the seashore, and that is the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, which has been made possible by private donations and by matching funds appropriated by the State. The seashore is a type of area for which, in my opinion, there is an especially urgent need. That need will be even greater for future generations, and the opportunities to conserve seashore areas are dwindling fast.

In this connection, I am glad to say that as a result of a generous donation to the Service, we are now making, and expect to have complete this year, a study of the remaining opportunities to preserve outstanding scenic and natural seashore areas along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. A reconnaissance of this vast stretch has been finished and individual areas are being studied and evaluated. The results are not yet ready for release, but I understand that the survey staff has found areas of considerably more than local or regional significance and different from any other areas now represented in the National Park System, which might well be set aside for future development. Many that do not meet the national standards, I am sure would be of great value to help meet the State and local needs. I hope that those that qualify for State and local recreation use will be so dedicated.

From the standpoint of geology, a major geological category, the meteor crater, is not represented in the National Park System, and it may be desirable to give further consideration to the preservation of other outstanding examples of major geological categories not represented in the System.

From the standpoint of preserving plant and animal types of biological interest, attention might be given to certain oceanic areas, such as a tropical area in the Virgin Islands. As you know, there is now a bill before the Congress to establish a Virgin Island National Park on St. John Island. This would add a unique and highly important unit to the System.

Of the main periods of American history, those that are least well represented in the National Park System are:

The Development of the English Colonies from 1700 to 1775

The Advance of the Frontier to 1830

Political and Military Affairs from 1830 to 1861

Westward Expansion and the Extension of the National Boundaries in the period 1830 to 1890

The Arts and Sciences to 1870 and

The Industrial, Agricultural and Business advances that have made

this Country strong and raised our standards of living

There is a disproportionately inadequate representation of Western history in the National Park System.

We are also out of balance in the archeological field. Fifteen of our 19 archeological areas are in the Southwest, largely, perhaps, because they were on public land at the time of their establishment. Outstanding examples should be considered in other parts of the Country, including the Territories.

Additionally, there is need, we believe, for a type of area that is managed for the primary purpose of active recreation and this is different from the national park concept. Such areas might be established on lands and waters of local State, interstate or National significance for their scenic and recreation qualities, but which, because of the necessity of permitting other and unrelated uses, might not be eligible for park status. Population distribution and the need for recreation opportunities might be given considerable weight in the selection of these areas, and they might also be established in the vicinity of national parks and monuments where they could absorb a considerable portion of the impact from camping, horseback riding, boating and other forms of active outdoor recreation demands. The policies governing their administration could be considerably more flexible than those in the national parks, since appropriate recreation use rather than preservation would be the dominant theme. A national plan for such recreation areas, and for permanent wilderness areas, the preservation of which is as yet beyond the scope of most of the State park programs, might be worked out between the States and the Federal agencies.

I do not wish to leave the impression that there should be large additions to the National Park System. The point in question is an adequate National Park System for 300 million people. But the problem of providing for the outdoor recreation-area needs of the Nation is closely related and, as we all know, involves other forms of land use and the cooperation of many agencies. Since the primary responsibility for meeting the day-to-day recreation-area needs rests with the States and their political subdivisions, the Federal agencies can be most helpful not by trying to carry the load themselves, but by facilitating the State and local park and recreation-area programs.

I realize fully that I have not stated the dimensions of a National Park System adequate for 300 million people. I have tried, however, to present some of the dimensions of the problem, to tell some of the steps we are taking toward meeting it and to suggest some trends in our thinking and planning that might help us find more satisfying answers. This, I believe, is in keeping with the sentiment of the Congress when it authorized and directed us to cooperate with the States and with other Federal agencies in providing adequate park, parkway and recreation-area facilities for the people of the United States.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The MISSION 66 program mentioned by Mr. Wirth has since received the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the President's Cabinet and has been recognized by Congress in initial appropriations. The Seashore and Recreation Survey on the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts was issued in 1956 under the title *Our Vanishing Shoreline*. The bill to create the Virgin Islands National Park was passed by Congress and signed by the President.

Recreational Use of the National Forests

DR. RICHARD E. McARDLE, Chief, Forest Service,
U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

AT ABOUT this time last Saturday afternoon I was in the entrance of the Commerce Department Building. One of the exhibits there is a "population clock," which shows the estimated present population of the United States. At the time I saw it, the *clock* showed a population of 164,952,766. As I stood watching it for a couple of minutes there was an increase of 10. Every 12 seconds there is a net gain of 1 in the number of people our country must feed, clothe, and shelter—around the clock, hour after hour, day after day, week after week, every 12 seconds, one more addition to our population. If I were to go back and look at the clock this afternoon, I would find that since I saw it Saturday afternoon we have 22,000 more people. In 3 days there has been added to our population the equivalent of a good-sized small town.

Now why do I start with this illustration? Am I trying to frighten you? No. I see no reason to be afraid of a steady increase in our population. Ours is a big country, still rich in many of the natural resources from which we obtain not only the bare necessities of life but additional things for a high standard of living and a fuller, more satisfying way of life.

I have no doubt about our ability to provide for more people. But to do so I think we must take a hard look and a long look toward the years ahead. We are going to have to do this anyway, sooner or later. And planning done too late is a costly way to do the job.

I am convinced also that these plans for the future must include provision for the ever-wider, ever-longer, ever-swifter stream of Americans seeking relaxation and enjoyment in the out-of-doors. This is one of the significant trends of the times. Right now, today, we are witnessing and feeling the impact of a dynamic trend toward outdoor activities of all kinds. People are moving from cities to the suburbs. Some jump clear over suburbs to establish homes in the country. For their vacations, more and more are going to the forests and parks, the seashores and high mountains to play and rest and escape the pressures of modern living. Some satisfy the urge to get out of doors by gardening or by broiling meat on outdoor fireplaces in their backyards. Others seek relaxation in city parks; still others seek the solitude of remote wilderness areas. There are all shades in between.

This movement to the out-of-doors has been explained as a result of more leisure time, better highways, more automobiles, improved standards of living. I think it goes deeper than that. Within the souls of men there is a deep-seated primitive desire to get back to the soil—close to Nature. This urge seems to express itself as the tension and competition of modern living grows. Escape to the out-of-doors is a kind of emotional safety valve that helps to keep things from blowing up. It is vital to the health and well-being of our country that our citizens have an opportunity occasionally to get away and enjoy unspoiled natural surroundings.

Many of the social and health problems that are plaguing us individually and collectively could be helped materially if we could get more people out into the open more often.

I read a statement the other day attributed to a police chief in one of our large western cities to the effect that a check of police sources in the United States has revealed that juvenile delinquency almost never follows a program of outdoor activity. The value of outdoor activity in developing desirable character traits in young people is well known to all of us. I am sure that it is of equal value in developing and maintaining the moral and physical stamina of older people.

I do not mean to preach a sermon. I do mean to say that I believe the work you are doing is of great importance to your communities and to the country. So I am glad to have this opportunity to talk with you about the part the national forests have in meeting the growing demand for outdoor recreation. To provide opportunities for fishing, hunting, camping, hiking, skiing, and other outdoor activities is a major part of our overall national-forest program.

The job has been growing faster than our ability to handle it. In 1924 there were 4 million recreational visits to the national forests. In 1954 there were 40 million. Recreational use of the national forests has doubled in the past 7 years. If that rate of increase merely continues and gets no larger, the recreational use of the national forests will be 80 million visits by 1963. From there on it is anyone's guess. National-forest recreational use has increased more rapidly than the total increase in population. People are coming to the national forests in greater and greater numbers in spite of inadequate facilities, in spite of total lack of any special improvements in some areas. I suspect that we are only seeing the beginning.

I am sure you know that in many respects the national forests are quite different from the recreational areas with which most of you have been particularly concerned. The national forests are dedicated to multiple-purpose management; whereas the national parks and monuments, municipal and State parks, and most other recreational areas are managed primarily or exclusively for recreation.

The national forests were established 50 years ago for the primary

purposes of preserving conditions favorable to streamflow and for providing a continuous supply of timber. But in addition to these two primary uses they furnish many other services, including recreation. The national forests are the habitat for many species of fish and wildlife. Exploration and development of minerals is permitted under the laws of the United States. Livestock grazing is permitted on lands suitable for that purpose. We issue special permits for hundreds of different kinds of occupancy and use, ranging all the way from cultivation of small patches of land suitable for farming, to rights-of-way for power lines, pipelines, and railroads, to permits for summer homes, resorts, and many other things. From the very beginning, our guiding principle has been that the resources of the national forests should be conserved with wise use. The greatest public good in the long run has been our measuring stick and our goal.

Multiple-purpose use, of course, does not mean that each and every major use will be practiced simultaneously on the same piece of ground. For example, areas designated for intensive recreational use are managed primarily, sometimes exclusively, for that purpose. On some areas, timber production is the dominant use. On these areas other uses, such as grazing, wildlife production, and extensive outdoor recreation must be harmonized with the objectives of protecting watersheds and producing and harvesting timber. Some national-forest areas are used to provide winter food for big game animals. On these areas, livestock grazing may be given second priority.

Multiple use of the national forests is the coordination of various uses, not on each acre, but on large blocks of land in a way designed to get the optimum combination of uses for the benefit of the public. Making multiple use work and fitting public recreation into this scheme of management is not an easy job, but it can be accomplished and is being done successfully on many national-forest areas. Almost daily this job is becoming more complex as the pressures mount for more public recreation, more timber harvesting, more wildlife, more water, more minerals, more grazing.

Now let me get down to what 181 million acres of national forests offer in the way of recreation. We believe that the national forests should provide an opportunity to enjoy simple forest-type recreation. We encourage camping, picnicking, swimming, skiing, hiking, riding, wilderness travel, hunting, fishing, mountain climbing, and the like. We do not encourage urban types of recreation because we believe these should be enjoyed in city and county areas. We try to keep our facilities simple and appropriate to the environment. We do not conduct tours, give lectures, or sponsor organized sports.

We believe that national-forest recreation should supplement the recreational facilities of States, cities, and the national parks and should not compete with or duplicate them. For many years we have

cooperated closely with the National Park Service and the States.

People need variety in recreation and outdoor environment. No one form of outdoor recreation can satisfy all people. School playgrounds, city parks, state parks and forests, parkways and highways, national parks and monuments, seashores, lakes and streams, and the national forests are needed to satisfy the varied tastes and requirements of the public. All such areas should be developed and used to contribute the particular type or types of recreation for which they are best suited.

The national forests provide many opportunities to enjoy wilderness. Wilderness requires relatively large areas of rugged back country. On the national forests there are 79 wilderness, wild, roadless, and primitive areas totaling 14 million acres. Here we plan to preserve the primitive environment. I could talk at length on this aspect of national-forest recreation, but I see that Howard Zahniser will follow me, and that's his subject.

Hunting, fishing, riding, and hiking are available on most national forests. Here are the greatest public hunting and fishing areas in the country—millions of acres without a "no trespassing" sign. The States manage the fish and game, and State licenses are required for hunting and fishing. The Forest Service and the States cooperate closely on management of the habitat.

Thousands of miles of trails, both outside of and inside of wilderness areas, offer some wonderful hiking. The national forests include many miles of the famous Oregon Skyline, Cascade Crest, Sierra, and Appalachian trails.

Highways and roads through the national forests are a recreational asset which many people usually do not fully appreciate. In addition to the main highways, which often pass through spectacular scenery over mountain passes, or along rugged canyons, the national forests have many special recreational drives and back roads of great charm. The Angeles Crest Highway, the Mt. Shasta Road, the Pikes Peak Highway, the Needles Drive, the Catalina Mountain Highway, the Sandia Crest Highway, the Mt. Evans Road, the Beartooth Highway, and many others are famous locally and even nationally. Highways and roads in the national forests have more than a hundred million visits per year by people driving over them just to enjoy the scenery and forest environment. The Forest Service does everything possible to preserve and enhance the attractiveness of highways and other major roads by preserving the natural environment along the roadside. We establish roadside zones of 200 feet or more in width, and these are kept in as natural a condition as possible.

Winter sports have come of age on the national forests in the last 20 years. The national forests have much of the best ski terrain in the West, and development of ski areas, ski lifts, and ski resorts has been phenomenal. The development of skiing as a popular sport illustrates

how land use and values change. Twenty-five or 30 years ago the high mountain passes in the West were something to get over in the winter—now they are teeming with skiers, and State highway crews have to plow out huge parking areas.

The National Park Service and the Forest Service have coordinated exceptionally well on winter-sports developments. The National Park Service does not believe that permanent ski-lift installations fit into the national parks' scheme of things, and I think they are right. To take care of this mass demand the Forest Service encourages the development of ski areas on the national forests. The national parks provide ski touring and ski areas served by rope tows and temporary lifts.

The organization camp is another link in the chain of recreational uses on the national forests. Groups of young people have a particular need for outdoor recreation where they can get guidance programs, education, and organized sports. Such camps must have simple facilities for sleeping, eating, and play. The Forest Service has 60 organization camps available at low cost to public-spirited groups who sponsor vacations for young people. We also allow organizations to build their own camps on the national forests under special-use permits. Many camps have been built by the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Y.M.C.A., church groups, lodges, cities, and counties. Last year these organization camps contributed almost 3 million man-days or boy- and girl-days of recreation for young people.

The Forest Service permits privately owned resorts to operate on national-forest land if there is public need for these services and accommodations. Resorts are expected to maintain structures appropriate to the environment. They serve many people who prefer to "rough it" with all the comforts of home.

We also recognize the desire of many people to have summer homes in the forest by leasing summer-home lots for vacation cabins. This, being a private use of national-forest land, ranks far below public uses in priority. Summer homes are carefully laid out on areas which are not needed for or are not suitable for higher priority uses. Permits authorizing summer homes require that they be built to reasonable standards and that sanitation be well taken care of. There are some 17,000 summer homes in the national forests.

Forty million visits now overtax the capacity of national-forest recreation areas and our ability to provide adequate sanitation, clean-up, and maintenance with the funds available. Sanitation and clean-up are inadequate at many popular recreation areas, and the facilities are wearing out. Over-crowding of popular areas is a common occurrence during summer weekends, and the overflow of people who use unimproved forest areas along the roads creates serious sanitation, fire-control, and water-pollution problems.

We have attempted to solve part of the problem of inadequate funds

by having concessionaires operate some of the larger, more intensively developed areas on a charge basis. About 50 areas are now being operated by concessionaires. The highest charge is 24 cents per person per day. Areas operated by concessionaires help by relieving us of the cost of clean-up and maintenance at these areas, but it is only a partial solution. At most, only 200 of our 4,700 improved campground and picnic areas are large enough to be profitably operated as charge areas.

Some States, counties, and cities have contributed generously toward the operation and maintenance of national-forest recreation areas which are used mainly by local people. Last year \$1,250,000 was contributed in money, time, and materials. California, Utah, Colorado, the cities of Tucson, Salt Lake City, Ogden, Denver, Los Angeles, and others have helped us keep conditions passable on some heavily used areas.

Our most urgent and immediately pressing problem is to get on top of the job of adequate clean-up and maintenance of existing recreational improvements. Although we have had some recent increases in appropriations, although we have shifted part of the load to concessionaires, and although we have been getting more cooperation from local agencies, we are losing ground. We are not keeping up with the increased use, or with the need for replacement of improvements, most of which were built long before World War II.

The next most urgent job is to expand existing facilities and improve new areas to take care of the expanding mass recreational use. Some of our present areas are losing their attractiveness. The soil is compacted, and the cover is wearing out. Trees and other vegetation have no chance to reproduce under such conditions. Dispersal and rotation of use would help solve this problem, but would require development of alternate areas, and that costs more money than we have.

From a recreation-planning standpoint we are in fairly good shape. Each national forest has a reasonably satisfactory recreation plan. I feel certain that sufficient areas already are set aside for future public recreation to accommodate the expected increase for the next 10 years. Sufficient other areas satisfactory for public recreation can be found to take care of the use for many years to come, provided funds become available for construction of the necessary facilities. We shall try to keep our forest recreation plans up to date and shall continue to reserve areas suitable for public uses. We are particularly careful to avoid putting low-priority uses, such as summer homes, on areas which may be needed for future public use.

It would be logical to end this talk by telling you what we plan to do about the millions of additional recreational visitors we will have by 1975. I would not be honest if I said that we know exactly what we will do with them. We don't. I can assure you, however, that we have the land to take care of them—it is waiting to be developed. We have trained personnel to take charge of the work, who know where and how

to develop needed areas. We are a bigger, stronger, more experienced Forest Service today than we were when this rush to the forests started. Given the means to do the job, we can plan and build the facilities to meet future recreational needs on the national forests. So I think I'll end my comments this way: If anyone doubts the present need for more adequate recreational facilities, let him go to any national forest on a pleasant weekend. If anyone doubts the ever-increasing need to provide for the future, let him go take a look at the population clock over in the Commerce Building. Somehow, someway, we *must* provide for this major use of public forest areas.

The Need for Wilderness Areas

HOWARD ZAHNISER, Executive Secretary of The Wilderness Society and Editor of *The Living Wilderness*, Washington, D. C.

IN ADDITION to our needs for urban and suburban parks and open spaces, in addition to the need for a countryside of rural loveliness, a landscape of beauty for our living, and *in addition* to the needs for parkways and parks and well-developed areas for all kinds of outdoor recreation, there is in our planning a need also to secure the preservation of some areas that are so managed as to be left unmanaged—areas that are undeveloped by man's mechanical tools and in every way unmodified by his civilization. These are the areas of wilderness that still live on in our national parks, national forests, state parks and forests, and indeed in various other categories of land likewise.

These are areas with values that are in jeopardy not only from exploitation for commodity purposes and from appropriation for engineering uses. Their peculiar values are also in danger from development for recreation, even from efforts to protect and manage them as wilderness.

It is important to recognize these peculiar values. It is important to distinguish our need for the areas as wilderness from the needs which they serve along with our other outdoor areas of parks, parkways, forests, lakes, and streams. It is fortunate in a program so comprehensive as this one for the National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People that there is consideration given to "Need for Wilderness Areas."

I regret that you do not have someone more capable than I to interpret this need, for I feel keenly a rather narrow limitation both in analyzing the problem we face and in representing the values with which we are concerned. It would undoubtedly be better also if we could approach this discussion through testimony rather than discourse, for I see about me many whose experience in the wilderness is richer than my own and in whose variety of impressions there doubtless is the best basis for the conclusions that I must first suggest and only then

submit to discussion. And there certainly are others here much more competent than I am to relate these rich values of wilderness to our programs for setting aside reservations as a means of protection. I can only plead a keen interest, a very deep concern, and an eagerness to do whatever I can to stimulate the more effective contributions of others.

Truly it would be hollow to discuss the wilderness except with a consciousness of its appeals and inspirations. Yet within the scope of this symposium there is hardly opportunity to evoke in the words of one speaker the experiences in the wilderness upon which depends all that is said. It will also thus be the easier to escape the need to distinguish the concrete wilderness experience from the experience in other areas of the great outdoors. How differs the experience that I recall of the robin singing so marvellously and melodiously in the evening along the Lake Solitude shores of the Cloud Peak Primitive Area of Wyoming's Big Horn National Forest from that of the liquid loveliness of the wood thrush that sang from the precious patch of woodland behind my own suburban home just as I sought an illustration of this perplexity? Here I need not answer this question but simply call it up for its answers in your own minds. For it is not the concrete experience with which I am concerned in this particular discussion but rather the abstract one that relates to our concepts of wilderness and our policies of reservations.

Of course, there is a great and practical need that resides in the desires of so many people for wilderness experiences, a need that should certainly be met. There is likewise a practical need for realizing our ideal of preserving for everyone the privilege of choosing to enjoy the wilderness if he or she so wishes. These are definite, practical needs for which we should, of course, provide in our programs.

I recognize these needs, yet I wish here to try to probe deeper into our fundamentals, to see if there really is a need that if unsatisfied would lead to deprivations or sacrifices that would be profoundly tragic or even destructive of our way of living.

SUPERLATIVE VALUES OF THE WILDERNESS

But, first I must point out another practical or immediate need, one that can be recognized as residing in our compulsion to save from destruction whatever is *best*. Some of our strongest determination to preserve wilderness arises from this motive. Robert Marshall, whose memory I honor with admiration and deep gratitude, conveys such an appreciation of the wilderness *as a superlative* in a short essay found among his papers by his brother George Marshall a couple of years ago and published posthumously as the editorial in the Summer 1954 issue of *The Living Wilderness*. He was essaying a demonstration of "certain distinctive values" that come to a person with a return for a time to the primitive life of the wilderness. I want to quote seven paragraphs, partly because they place before us so authoritatively the benefits of wilderness, but mainly to suggest the need for preserving the wilderness

because it is something superlative. Note the variety of superlatives in these paragraphs—"best," "ideal," "perfect," "unique," "most perfect."

"The wilderness," wrote Bob Marshall, "furnishes the best environment which remains in the country for physical adventure. It is difficult to overestimate the importance adventure assumes in the longings of innumerable vigorous people. Lack of opportunity to satisfy such longings undoubtedly is responsible for much unhappiness, for a considerable portion of the crime which is so often committed as a means of self-expression, and, if we are to believe William James and Bertrand Russell, even for war.

"A wilderness journey provides the ideal conditions for developing physical hardiness. In the wilderness a person cannot buy transportation or services. He must provide them for himself. He cannot find machinery, to relieve him of the need for expending his own strength and energy. If he gets into trouble he must get himself out of it or take the consequences.

"The wilderness also furnishes the perfect environment for peacefulness and relaxation. Time is of no consequence in an environment which has been developing through an unbroken chain of natural sequences for millions of years. In the true wilderness there are no jarring notes, no discordant clashes with one's instinctive sense of what is fitting and proper.

"From an esthetic standpoint the wilderness is unique because in it alone immensity is a major quality of the beauty which one enjoys. The values which one gets in a view from some lofty mountain top cannot be comprehended at all if one tries to reduce them to color or form or pattern.

"All these esthetic values are present, but they are blended with the dominant value of being a part of an immensity so great that the human being who looks upon it vanishes into utter insignificance.

"The wilderness is also unique esthetically in that it stimulates not just the sense of sight, as does art, or the sense of sound, as does music, but all of the senses which man has. The traveler wandering at evening to the shore of some wilderness lakelet senses through his sight the pink sunset sky and the delightful pattern which the deep bay makes among the spruce trees which rise from its shores; senses through his hearing the lapping of the water against the rocky shore and the evening song of the thrush; senses through his smell the scent of balsam and the marsh flowers at the water's edge; senses through his touch the gentle wind which blows on his forehead and the softness of the sphagnum beneath his feet. The wilderness is all of these senses harmonized with immensity into a form of beauty which to many human beings is the most perfect experience of the earth."

BUT IS THE WILDERNESS ESSENTIAL?

Who that can thus see so clearly these superlative values of the wilderness through the perceptions and interpretations of Robert Marshall can fail to sense a need for preserving wilderness areas? Who in a democratic government that seeks to serve the public interest even for the sake of minorities would wish to lose an opportunity to realize a policy for wilderness preservation? Who that looks on into the future with a concern for such values would not wish to insure for posterity the freedom to choose the privilege of knowing the unspoiled wilderness?

But are these superlative values essential?

Is the exquisite also a requisite?

I think it is.

I believe that at least in the present phase of our civilization we have a profound, a fundamental need for areas of wilderness—a need

that is not only recreational and spiritual but also educational and scientific, and withal essential to a true understanding of ourselves, our culture, our own natures, and our place in all Nature.

This need is for areas of the earth within which we stand without our mechanisms that make us immediate masters over our environment—areas of wild Nature in which we sense ourselves to be, what in fact I believe we are, dependent members of an interdependent community of living creatures that together derive their existence from the Sun.

By very definition this wilderness is a need. The idea of wilderness as an area without man's influence is man's own concept. Its values are human values. Its preservation is a purpose that arises out of man's own sense of his fundamental needs.

THE WILDERNESS AS VACATION COUNTRY

Wilderness to most of us is vacation country, thought about for the most part in connection with occasional good-time escapes from a civilized life which itself somehow or other seems to be "reality." It is usually only after reflection that one perceives the true reality in the wilderness.

It is, of course, not surprising that recreational values are generally understood as representing the dominant importance of wilderness in our modern civilization. Only in a society that produces the erosion of human beings, the wearing away of soul and body and spirit that is so familiar in our modern circumstances, does the concept of recreation appear.

The wilderness represents the antithesis of all that produces these conditions which recreation remedies. It not only provides the kind of recreation most needed by the increasingly large number who seek wilderness, but it also affords the background for the kind of outdoor recreation for which conveniences and accommodations are provided—the frontier where those who do not wish to experience the rigors of wilderness living and travel may still know in some degree the tonic benefits of its wildness.

Recreational values of the wilderness are thus not only intrinsic but also pervasive throughout the outdoor recreation program of a society with the tastes and resources of the United States. Wilderness preservation is a part therefore of a comprehensive recreational program—a very important part of such a program's provision for outdoor recreation—and it is the ultimate resource for that phase of outdoor recreation that ministers to the individual as such.

But wilderness vacations have those overtones that make them more than narrowly recreational. They are more likely to be joyous than merry, more refreshing than exciting, more engrossing than diverting. Their rewards are satisfactions. There is likely to be a seriousness about wilderness recreation and an earnestness among those who seek it. So

philosophers of education who describe their goals in such terms as "life adjustment" and "personality development" may find in the wilderness a most valuable resource, and recreational values in such a context become profoundly educational.

THE WILDERNESS AND HUMAN REALITIES

Deeper and broader than the recreational value of wilderness, although indeed encompassing it, is the importance that relates it to our essential being, indicating that the understandings which come in its surroundings are those of true reality. Our lives seem so derivative from the wilderness, we ourselves seem so dependent on a renewal of our inspiration from these wild sources, that I wonder sometimes if we could long survive a final destruction of all wilderness. Are we not truly and in reality *human*, essentially, as spiritual creatures nurtured and sustained—directly or indirectly—by a wildness that must always be renewed from a living wilderness?

Is it not with some such understanding as this that we realize the essential importance of our wilderness areas?

Is it not thus that we can explain the fact that a wilderness vacation is remembered as more than sport, more than fun, more than simple recreation?

Are not these the understandings which give such profound significance to the longer sojourns that a civilized man or woman occasionally spends in a return to the wilderness?

It is characteristic of wilderness to impress its visitors with their relationship to other forms of life, and to afford those who linger an intimation of the interdependence of all life. In the wilderness it is thus possible to sense most keenly our human membership in the whole community of life on the Earth. And in this possibility is perhaps one explanation for our modern deep-seated need for wilderness.

Because we are so well able to do things, we forget that we can do them only because something else is done. We forget that we can continue only so long as other men, other animals, and other forms of life also keep on doing things. We forget that the real source of all our life is not in ourselves, not even in the Earth itself, but more than 90 million miles away, in the Sun. And not one of us is able alone to live on this great source. We live only as members of a community.

If for a time some of us might seem to do well at the tragic expense of other life in this community, we can be sure that it would likewise be at the expense of our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren through the generations that might live. For we know that we can live on in our descendants only if our Earth community lives on with them. We not only exist but we are immortal on the Earth only as members of a great community.

These are facts and understandings that have been known to us only

a comparatively short time—through the observations and studies made by our scientists—and not all of us have appreciated them rightly. It is not long since man thought of himself as the center of the universe, thought even of the Sun—the very source of all our life—as a light by day revolving about the Earth. As our new understanding has come—through science—science also has brought us many other new and wonderful discoveries, and the new knowledge of what we *are* has been overlooked by many of us in our eagerness for the new knowledge of what we can *do*. We have become as proud over what we can *do* as ever our ancestors could have been over themselves as the center of the universe.

We deeply need the humility to know ourselves as the dependent members of a great community of life, and this can indeed be one of the spiritual benefits of a wilderness experience. Without the gadgets, the inventions, the contrivances whereby men have seemed to establish among themselves an independence of nature, without these distractions, to know the wilderness is to know a profound humility, to recognize one's littleness, to sense dependence and interdependence, indebtedness, and responsibility.

Perhaps, indeed, this is the *distinctive* ministration of wilderness to modern man, the characteristic effect of an area which we most deeply need to provide for in our preservation programs.

EDUCATIONAL VALUES

Thus, the most profound of all wilderness values in our modern world is an educational value.

As the so-called conquest of Nature has progressed, men and women—separated by civilization from the life community of their origin—have become less and less aware of their dependence on other forms of life and more and more misled into a sense of self sufficiency and into a disregard of their interdependence with the other forms of life with which they—together—derive their existence from the solar center of the universe.

In the areas of wilderness that are still relatively unmodified by man it is, however, possible for a human being, adult or child, to sense and see his own humble, dependent relationship to all of life.

In these areas, thus, are the opportunities for so important, so neglected a part of our education—the gaining of the true understanding of our past, ourselves, and our world which will enable us to enjoy the conveniences and liberties of our urbanized, industrialized, mechanized civilization and yet not sacrifice an awareness of our human existence as spiritual creatures nurtured and sustained by and from the great community of life that comprises the wildness of the universe, of which we ourselves are a part.

Paradoxically, the wilderness which thus teaches modern man his

dependence on the whole community of life can also teach him a needed personal independence—an ability to care for himself, to carry his own burdens, to provide his own fuel, prepare his own food, furnish his own shelter, make his own bed, and—perhaps most remarkable of all—transport himself by walking.

In these lessons are further the lessons of history—a stimulus to patriotism of the noblest order—for in the wilderness the land still lives as it was before the pioneers fashioned in and from it the civilization we know and enjoy.

With these lessons come also the understanding that physical, psychic, and spiritual human needs are such that wilderness recreation should always be available and, in fact, should be enjoyed to a much greater extent than it now is.

Thus recreational and educational values of the wilderness merge.

In a culture like that which we call modern we can be sure that it will be increasingly important for students, of the present and of future generations, to know what the wilderness has to teach—through their own experiences; through educators who are informed and corrected by wilderness experiences; through photographs, paintings, writings, and other educational and informational materials with a validity insured by a still living wilderness.

So long as wilderness exists in reality, providing actual resorts for human beings, giving a sense of actuality to pictorial and literary representations of the wilderness, and affording the scenes for further research, so long will the safeguards against an urban, industrial, mechanized ignorance of the facts of human life be effective.

HISTORICAL VALUES

There are monumental or historical values of the wilderness also, values which are closely related both to educational and recreational values. The wilderness has been described as “a piece of the long ago that we still have with us,” and it is highly prized by many people as such. It perpetuates on our continent not only the scene of the pioneering activities of the first white men in this hemisphere but also a still more ancient scene. The areas preserved are monuments to the pioneers’ conquests, but they also are samples of the natural world without the influence of modern man. They have deep values in the continuing opportunity they afford to relive the lives of ancestors and thus, with also the anticipation of posterity’s similar interest, to participate in the immortality of the generations.

SCIENTIFIC VALUES

There are profoundly important scientific values of the wilderness also. These are similar to those of historical importance in depending on the preservation of areas as they existed, and exist, without the influence of modern man. These values too have an educational aspect,

but their more precisely scientific importance is in relation to research. Their research uses are dual: They afford the scenes for fundamental investigations of the natural world of living creatures unmodified by man; they afford also "check" areas where none of the factors being compared in a particular study (land-use research, for example) have been operative.

The scientific values pertain not only to research and original investigation but also to the study and observation that are essentially educational in their purpose. Wilderness areas, including the smaller natural areas and also the extensive wild regions, should accordingly be preserved for the sake of the field study that they make possible for students in each generation. They serve this purpose for the summer camps of youth organizations, for field stations of college summer-school classes, and also for the more advanced excursions of graduate students. And Aldo Leopold exclaimed: "As a matter of fact, there is no higher or more exciting sport than that of ecological observation."

WILDERNESS NEEDS INTER-RELATED

So we have various needs for wilderness that are all derived from a need to maintain an awareness of our human relationships to all life, the need to guard ourselves against a false sense of our own sufficiency. We need to draw ourselves constantly toward the center of things and not allow our eccentricities to carry us off on a tangent, toward increasing unhappiness.

We are a part of the wildness of the universe. That is our nature. Our noblest, happiest character develops with the influence of wildness. Away from it we degenerate into the squalor of slums or the frustration of clinical couches. With the wilderness we are at home.

Some of us think we see this so clearly that for ourselves, for our children, our continuing posterity, and our fellow men we covet with a consuming intensity the fullness of the human development that keeps its contact with wildness. Out of the wilderness, we realize, has come the substance of our culture, and with a living wilderness—it is our faith—we shall have also a vibrant vital culture—an enduring civilization of healthful happy people who like Antaeus perpetually renew themselves in contact with the earth.

This is not a disparagement of our civilization—no disparagement at all—but rather an admiration of it to the point of perpetuating it. We like the beef from the cattle grazed on the public domain. We relish the vegetables from the lands irrigated by virtue of the Bureau of Reclamation—*OUR* Bureau of Reclamation, too, we should recall, now and then. We carry in our packs aluminum manufactured with the help of hydroelectric power from great reservoirs. We motor happily on paved highways to the approaches of our wilderness. We journey in streamlined trains and in transcontinental airplanes to conferences on wilder-

ness preservation. We nourish and refresh our minds from books manufactured out of the pulp of our forests. We enjoy the convenience and comfort of our way of living—urban, village, and rural. And we want this civilization to endure and to be enjoyed on and on by healthful happy citizens.

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

It is this civilization, this culture, this way of living that will be sacrificed if our wilderness is lost. *What sacrifice!*

Our only hope to avert this loss is in our deliberate effort to preserve the wilderness we have. The ramifications of our developing mechanical enterprises are such that only those areas which are set aside for preservation will persist as wilderness.

It behooves us then to do two things: First we must see that an adequate system of wilderness areas is designated for preservation, and then we must allow nothing to alter the wilderness character of the preserves.

We have made an excellent start on such a program. Our obligation now—to those who have been our pioneers and to those of the future, as well as to our own generation—is to see that this program is not undone but perfected.

In our marvelous national park system; in the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas of our national forests; on extensive tracts of Indian reservations; in certain units of the national wildlife refuge system; and in state parks, and some others too, we have areas that have either been set aside as wilderness or that are being protected in a way that safeguards wilderness.

The process of designation of areas of wilderness for preservation, however, is not complete as yet. There are still some to be added—especially grassland, seashore, and desert. There is no doubt, so far as I know, about the correctness of the designation of any of the areas now being preserved. There are, I understand, some boundary adjustments that need to be made for certain areas that were established without opportunity for adequate care as to exact boundaries. There are zoning questions in some of our parks. There are some additions that can be made to established areas. There are private holdings within these public areas that should be acquired.

These aspects of the perfection of the designations should be cared for in a persisting program. And the other potential units in this system of wilderness should be sought out as soon as possible.

For these areas of wilderness we should obtain the maximum possible degree of security. We need Congressional action, to provide for their preservation as wilderness, and we should move forward as steadily as we can toward this action.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS SYSTEM PROPOSED

A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system should

be drawn up as soon as possible with the joint cooperation of the federal land-administering agencies and conservation organizations.

It should affirm the national policy to preserve such a wilderness system.

It should define the proper use of areas within the system and should provide for the protection of the areas from inconsistent uses.

Areas to be included might well be specified in the bill, and provision for additions to the list of areas by executive order or formal designation by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior could be included, with the further provision that the removal of any area from the system can be effected only by Congress.

The bill should make clear that no changes in jurisdiction would be involved and that no new land-administration agency would be established. The agency administering an area designated as a unit in the national wilderness preservation system, according to this proposal, would simply be charged with the responsibility of preserving its wilderness character. National forest areas would continue as at present but with the guarantee of perpetuity that Congress can give. National park and monument areas would continue under the administration of the National Park Service. Such national wildlife refuges as would be included would continue to be administered as wildlife refuges, but these particular refuges would be preserved without developments and installations that would alter their wilderness character.

In other words, each area in the system would continue to serve the peculiar purpose that it has, or would have, in the program of its particular administering agency, but every agency would be charged with the responsibility of preserving the wilderness character of any area of the national wilderness preservation system in its custody.

A Wilderness Preservation Commission, modeled possibly after the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission that has functioned in connection with the establishment of wildlife refuges, might be set up to assist in the establishment and administration of this wilderness system—to conduct a survey in cooperation with land-administering agencies, to recommend to Congress any necessary adjustments in the program, and to prepare—or coordinate the preparation of—maps and other material for the information of the public with reference to this system.

CONCLUSION

Conservation is both practical and idealistic, as is well demonstrated in our concern with wilderness preservation.

It is good and sound to realize that in preserving areas of wilderness we are recognizing our own true human interest. It seems good, ethical, to consider ourselves as members of a community of life that embraces the earth—and to see our own welfare as arising from the prosperity of the community.

Yet there may be danger in too conscious, too deliberate, too intent an effort to see all in terms of our own welfare. Jesus suggested that self-seeking is not the way to self-realization; not deliberately but through indirection human beings realize their best welfare, by losing sight of themselves.

It is a great satisfaction to be able to demonstrate to another that an unspoiled wilderness is important because it serves man's need for "escape," but going to the wilderness to escape from something is no certain way of actually being in the wilderness at all. The only way to escape from one's self in the wilderness is to lose one's self there. More realistically, the true wilderness experience is one, not of escaping, but of finding one's self by seeking the wilderness.

The sum of this moralizing may be in forsaking human arrogance and courting humility in a respect for the community and with regard for the environment. The central human importance of such experience, I believe, constitutes profound evidence of need for wilderness areas. An understanding of these fundamental needs, as well as the so-called more practical needs to meet recreational demands of people for wilderness experience—this understanding should inspire us anew to work for the perfection of a national program for wilderness preservation—a program to serve not only our own human needs but also those of the generations to follow.

Wildlife Resources and Their Protection

DR. IRA N. GABRIELSON, Wildlife Management Institute,
Washington, D. C.

IN DISCUSSING the protection of wildlife resources in a short paper, it seems desirable to define what is meant by the term *wildlife*. As here used, it includes not only the game birds, mammals, and fish, which are commonly thought of when wildlife management is mentioned, but all wild species in which man may have an interest. In discussing the management of wildlife, we are really referring to management in terms of human interest. This may mean protection and attempts to increase a species or it may be attempts to reduce the numbers of an animal which adversely affects something in which some man or groups of men have a more immediate interest.

The knowledge that useful and beautiful wildlife species need protective legislation goes far back into colonial times. The first colonists took such animals as they needed with little thought of the future, but it was not long until the more desirable forms were so reduced in numbers around the settlements that taking them for food or clothing became more difficult. It was, therefore, logical that the first protective laws designed to restrict the human harvest were developed to safeguard

those animals that were of most immediate economic importance, such as deer.

As human population increased, it became more and more necessary to control the utilization of wild forms. Today, a maze of state and Federal laws protect or permit the management of these resources. I prefer the word *management* rather than *protection* since it has a far broader implication, although protection from human overutilization is the oldest wildlife management device still in use in the country. Over the years we have learned that protection is a vital and necessary part of wildlife management, but under many circumstances it cannot, by itself, provide an abundance of the species in which we are interested.

We have become increasingly conscious of the deficiencies of protection alone coincident with the development of machinery and methods by which man can substantially alter the character of the vegetation and the land use over vast areas. The pioneer with his axe and plow was responsible for many changes in vegetation, but the movements of the pioneers and their effect upon the landscape were slow and local compared to modern methods that can denude vast areas of land and completely change the character of the plants that grow on it. These changes, in themselves, induce tremendous changes in the wildlife populations. Some species increase; others decrease, according to their ecological needs.

These tremendous changes, both in the land and waterscape of America, have led to the development of a new art—the art of wildlife management. It is the art of applying sound biological information to the management of the wildlife and human activities affecting it. The wildlife manager's major job is to retain habitat and a place for wildlife in the ever-changing pattern of land use and to fit the wildlife needs into the equally important human needs, as best he can.

It is an art that has grown rapidly. The basic knowledge of the limitations and the potentials of wildlife species have been greatly increased in the last 25 years. We have more definite knowledge than ever before, even though there are still extensive gaps in this knowledge, and many basic principles are poorly if at all understood.

We learned long ago that protection from undue human utilization or human interference will permit most species to survive and to increase in numbers to the potential of the living quarters and food that is available. So long as suitable habitat is present, control of utilization is sometimes the major and often the only management device needed to maintain many species. The largely unspoiled habitat in our national parks and wilderness areas is suitable for maintaining many kinds of wildlife, and as long as the environment and the vegetation remain suitable, wildlife populations will persist.

There are startling exceptions to this general rule—the members of the deer family, for example, can, with protection and in the absence of

predators, become so numerous that they destroy the very food plants upon which they depend. The Yellowstone elk herds are well known examples of the problems caused by an over-abundance of browsing animals. Similar situations have developed in many sections of the country, and the public is slowly learning that management of any species of deer may involve a limitation of its maximum numbers as well as protection when the numbers are too low. Another exception is found in certain species that have been so reduced in numbers that they rebuild populations slowly or not at all even under the most rigid protection. The whooping crane, California condor, and ivory-billed woodpecker are well known examples of such species.

Utilization of wildlife can take a number of forms. There is a great and growing number of people who get their pleasure out of the chance to see wildlife. Many of these are also camera enthusiasts who spend much time, energy, and money in attempting to get photographs. This is a recreational use which has a high value and is peculiarly important because it does not interfere with the wildlife or result in any decrease in its numbers.

There are many people who turn to wildlife for recreational outlets by hunting or fishing. There are now wildlife administrative agencies in every State, as well as wildlife management agencies in the Federal Government. Most of the emphasis has been placed on those species that are considered game. In fact, there is a strong tendency in many state departments, and at times in the Federal Government, to overlook any except the game species in management plans or programs.

Since all wildlife is considered a public resource, this is an unduly narrow-minded and short-sighted policy. There are a few outstanding examples of States that do give consideration, time, and effort to the welfare of species other than those that provide targets for the guns or objectives for the anglers. Most states have good laws protecting non-game species, but too often little or no attention is given to enforcement of such laws. This is especially true of those protecting hawks and owls, which despite the widespread prejudice against them are known to be useful in helping in the control of rodents that are injurious to crops.

While the art of wildlife management is growing rapidly, there still is much room for improvement in the administration of this resource before we will be applying intelligently the factual knowledge and understanding that is now available. There is, of course, need for extended and continuous research in this field to fill the broad gaps in our knowledge and to measure the effects of continually changing conditions on wild populations.

It is, however, possible to measure with some accuracy the objectives of a wildlife administration. One that gives first consideration to the welfare of the resource in its management programs and endeavors to make its regulations and management policies in such a

way as to give wild populations the benefit of any doubt that may exist is usually doing a sound and sane management job. One that lets pressure groups or political considerations dictate the policies and programs is usually not doing a good job of wildlife management.

Measured by these standards, there are many States that are doing good to excellent jobs; there are others that are not. In some cases, it is lack of desire to do anything but a political job; in others, it is the lack of adequate authority to do a good job. This latter element shows up most strongly in States where the Legislature still retains the prerogatives of making the detailed regulations governing the harvesting of fish, game, furbearers, and other species. Nearly always such laws are based on political considerations and seldom, if ever, on the needs of the species.

In those States that are getting accurate information on the condition of the wildlife populations, it is sometimes possible to relax certain restrictions and permit a greater enjoyment of the resource with no harm to it. As examples, I may cite the general relaxing of protective regulations governing warm-water fish, as knowledge of their population and reproductive rates have been developed and applied. The general liberalization of deer hunting regulations in many States is another example of the application of new and more accurate knowledge of populations and population dynamics. These are only two examples of a number that could be given.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that with an adequate staff of trained men it is possible to obtain reasonably accurate information on population trends and the effect of hunting regulations. There are a number of conspicuous examples of successful management of local populations of game birds, mammals, or fish based upon knowledge of the resource, its reproductive rate, and its relation to the food and cover that it requires. A growing number of States are doing a good job in this respect, and it is not too much to hope that that number will increase.

When it comes to managing migratory birds, it is more difficult to get accurate information and more difficult to apply it with any certainty. It is relatively easy, with modern techniques, to get some idea of the kill taken from the birds that are congregated in any locality. It is much more difficult to get an accurate measure of the total drain by hunting on a population of birds that is subject to hunting pressure over a migratory route of some 2,000 miles or more and over a season that usually extends from September 1 until after the first of January. It is theoretically possible to wipe out or to decimate a group of birds from a particular breeding area even though the total harvest out of the continental flock may not be excessive.

If the welfare of the resource is the prime consideration, it is necessary to be somewhat conservative in making regulations. Since the passage of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, there is no question but what the

administrative policy of the Biological Survey and by the Fish and Wildlife Service has generally given primary consideration for the welfare of the resource.

There has, however, been a growing doubt in the minds of many conservationists as to whether the welfare of the resource is now being given sufficient consideration by those responsible for the administration of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. In the face of a declining population for two years, there has been a considerable relaxing of the regulations. This has been particularly noticeable in California where special consideration has been given to that state under the guise of helping in an admittedly serious depredation problem. Former Under Secretary of Interior Ralph Tudor, following his resignation, stated in an article in the *Saturday Evening Post* that the waterfowl administration had been set up to please the California duck hunters, and a review of the record provides some evidence to support this statement.

The California "experimental feeding program," has now been in effect for two years. Following the first year's operation, there was widespread criticism of the manner in which it had been carried out. A review of the information furnished by the California Department of Fish and Game does not indicate that the program has improved materially in its second year's operation and that it has had little value in reducing depredations, the chief reason given in justifying it.

In the first year, 141 clubs were licensed to "feed" and this year 140 clubs actually participated. The real depredations on the rice and other grain crops in California normally come before the hunting season, and feeding before the hunting season is probably the major contribution that this feeding program could possibly make. Reports indicate that in 1953, slightly under 20 percent of the total amount of feed provided was used prior to the hunting season; while in 1954, it was slightly over 20 percent. The total amount of food so provided is not great enough to provide any significant part of this food supply for waterfowl reported from California at that season, and it appears certain that, as far as reducing depredations is concerned, this has not been a conspicuous success.

The statement has been made many times by club members that it did not noticeably increase their duck kill to be able to feed, but that it did enable them to get their birds in a shorter period of time, which, according to their statements, is the real inducement for their use of feed under this program.

There are reported to be 1,300 duck clubs in California with a membership of about 13,000. According to the latest figures there were 193,196 duck stamps sold in California. These figures indicate how small a part of the California hunters really desire this "feeding program." About 10 percent of the clubs, or a little over one-half of one percent of the hunters, operated under it in each of the two years.

This concession to California is, as could be anticipated, leading to serious complications for the Department of the Interior in its dealings with other sections of the country. For example, both Ohio senators and both Maryland senators recently have been getting considerable publicity for their persistent efforts to get equal favors for a small minority of the waterfowl hunters in their states.

In Ohio, about 5 percent of the total number of waterfowl hunters hunt in the Erie marshes, and this is the group that wants the privilege of baiting. Their kill, according to the figures of the Ohio Conservation Department, amounts to about 2.6 ducks per hunter per day, as compared to an average of 0.7 of one duck per hunter per day for all those who shoot outside the Erie marshes. Despite the fact that the Erie marsh hunters already enjoy a 4.1 advantage over the average gunner, this group is exerting vigorous political pressure for added privileges for themselves, in the face of the fact that waterfowl populations have declined for two successive years, and that the winter inventory shows a decrease for this year. It will take better-than-average hatching and breeding success to prevent a decline from showing up for the third successive year when the birds come south in the fall.

In Maryland, the demands are the same that were voiced back in the mid-30's when the birds reached their lowest ebb. At that time, the delegations came to my office and demanded about the same things that are being voiced in behalf of a certain element of Maryland duck hunters by the senators from that state. As I recall it now, they wanted baiting and live decoys restored, longer seasons, and bigger bag limits. I vividly recall one ex-governor of that state pounding my desk and shouting, interspersed with considerable profanity, that he did not care whether there were any waterfowl left after he was dead; he wanted to shoot ducks while he was alive. After that, he did not care. He was a lot more frank than the average, but his objective was much the same.

The question is often asked, what is wrong with baiting? As a matter of fact, all States have long since outlawed the practice of baiting or using salt to attract resident game to the guns, and only in the case of migratory birds was it legally permitted to continue until it was banned during the great duck depression in the mid-30's. There are two things against it, aside from ethical questions, that are raised by many sportsmen. First, it is too efficient. As long as it was used by a limited number of hunters, it did not adversely affect the waterfowl populations. As its use became more widespread, it became more efficient and more deadly. With the growing number of duck hunters, I can see no possibility of a return to baiting without the destruction of the waterfowl resource. Second, it further stacks the deck in favor of a group of hunters who already have great advantages over the average fellow who buys a duck stamp.

These demands, at a time when waterfowl populations are declining,

and coming from States in which no depredation problem is involved to confuse the thinking on the subject, are bringing the situation to a definite showdown. Conservationists should extend a vote of thanks to the baiting advocates, Bricker, Bender, and Butler and Beall, for bringing it into focus so sharply.

The original concessions made to California have brought their inevitable results in increasing demands for similar consideration for other groups in other places, and the situation will continue to get worse until it is corrected. Conservationists throughout the country earnestly hope that the Department of the Interior, in view of the growing crisis which apparently confronts the waterfowl populations, will give the birds the breaks in the 1955 regulations; that they will take another look and another approach to the depredations problem; and that no consideration will be given to the political pressures so prominently discussed in the press in recent weeks.

Is it too much to hope that the Department of the Interior will chart a straight course based on sound management principles? If they do, I believe they can be assured the support of every conservationist in the country.

Discussion

OPENING the discussion, Fred M. Packard said he believed the conference had just heard one of the most masterly philosophical statements of the ethical foundation of the wilderness concept ever presented. He compared Mr. Zahniser's eloquence and deep insight to the classic essays of John Muir, Henry Thoreau, and Aldo Leopold, and expressed the hope it would be long studied as a guiding criterion for the preservation of wilderness.

Mr. Walter Von Broock asked for the floor to present his proposal that the Delaware Water Gap be preserved as The Edison National Park-Interstate as a joint effort of the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania and the Federal Government. After his explanation of steps taken by the two States, and interest had been aroused in them, there was discussion as to whether the area was best suited to national park or interstate park status.

A number of questions were asked the speakers about points raised in their addresses, especially about the best ways to secure adequate funds for the recreational and wildlife activities of the Forest Service, and to ensure continued preservation of the national wildlife refuges.

Mr. Jack F. Lewis, of Wyoming, asked for the floor to express the view that the opposition of conservationists to Echo Park

dam was not justified. He spoke of the need of the Upper Colorado States for irrigation and water, and indicated that the people of those States understand they cannot obtain it without this dam. He considered the opposition to the dam was based on inadequate knowledge of the subject. In response, Mr. Packard analyzed the Echo Park dam controversy, and noted that this dam is a power and storage project, and it would not contribute any irrigation water. The conservationists do not oppose the overall Colorado Project, but protested when this unnecessary invasion to a national park was included. Mr. Gutermuth rose to comment as one who had attended all the hearings on the subject, and who had read every published report about it, and has handled correspondence totalling thousands of letters, as well as visiting Dinosaur National Monument four times, he did not consider himself or his colleagues misinformed about the project.

Service of National Parks

Presiding: SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS McKAY,
Washington, D. C.

I WANT to offer you an expression of my sentiments and my convictions about the national parks—sentiments and convictions that guide the Department of the Interior in arriving at decisions that affect the parks.

First, let me make clear my belief that parks—all kinds of parks—are a fundamental necessity.

Their importance to our way of life must inevitably grow as we surround ourselves more and more with the trappings of civilization, and as more and more of us spend most of our lives where nearly everything in sight is man-made. The open spaces where we can get close to the works of the Creator are steadily diminishing.

The community or the State or the Nation which makes inadequate provision—or no provision at all—for parks and playgrounds is today recognized for what it is—short-sighted, lacking in vision or concern for those who live in it.

And make no mistake about it; I fully recognize both the pressures to which the national parks are constantly subjected and the necessity of resisting them.

In addition, let me assure you of the deep concern of the Administration with the needs of the National Park System.

That is a concern which I share without any mental reservations at all.

Speaking for myself, that concern is two-fold. For one thing, we need to know what the national parks really need. We must find the answer to that question on the basis of a long view.

Our fundamental objective is that the parks shall be as beautiful and as useful to Americans of a hundred years from now as they are today—or more beautiful because better planned and protected and more useful because of better techniques of making them so.

For another, once we have determined those needs and have arrived at an orderly program for meeting them, we must exert ourselves to find the means of putting that program into effect.

We are looking forward to the 50th anniversary year of the passage of the Act which established the National Park Service. We hope to determine what is needed for a 10-year program which, starting in the fiscal year 1957, would make the National Park System in every respect what it should be by the time that 50th anniversary year rolls around.

In studying this problem we are guided by the belief that there should be no restrictions on our thinking. We are simply attempting to determine what needs to be done, regardless of previous practices or preconceived notions or whether existing law would permit.

Any institution—and national parks are no exception—tends to become mired in its own past, sometimes to its serious detriment. So it seems to me that this is a most healthy sort of undertaking.

It starts from these premises—that the national parks exist to provide enjoyment to human beings; that that enjoyment should be of kinds that arise from the nature of the areas themselves; and that to provide it at its fullest requires that the natural scene be safeguarded as fully as is humanly possible.

Tribute to National Parks

BRADLEY H. PATTERSON, JR., Assistant Cabinet Secretary,
Washington, D. C.

IT IS a great pleasure to be with you tonight and I regret, as you do, that Governor Howard Pyle of Arizona, for whom I am substituting, is unable to be here.

I would simply like to leave three comments with you tonight.

Speaking as a camper and one who has travelled to many of the National Parks with his family, I can testify personally—though such testimony is hardly needed tonight—to the human and spiritual value of recreation in the National Parks. Speaking personally in that vein, I would like to lend my sincere encouragement to your efforts to broaden and improve the opportunities for outdoor recreation in American life.

Speaking as a parent who with my wife has taken our three children on several trans-continental trips through the National Parks, I think that a point which often needs emphasizing is the value of such an experience for children. The naturalist and interpretive services at the Parks—the museums, lectures, trips, pictures, and exhibits—are tre-

mendously helpful in explaining to children, as young as four, the meaning of scenery which surrounds them. They long remember those experiences; such supplemental education becomes a permanent and immediately noticeable addition to their cultural world.

Finally, speaking as Assistant Cabinet Secretary, I know you will be happy to hear that Secretary McKay is working with the White House in preparing for a discussion in Cabinet of the major problems which the National Parks now face and the courses of action which can be taken to meet them. We are thus going to have discussed, at the highest level of Government, the present and future objectives of the Park System in order that this Administration may do everything possible to protect and improve these areas for the recreation of all the American people.

Importance of National Parks

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, U. S. Senator from Virginia

I AM delighted to be here. It is quite a relief to me to make a speech and not to discuss the budget or the Federal debt. I take an intense interest in everything outdoors. That is one of the reasons why I selected apple growing as my business occupation. They say that when you get old and retire you must have a hobby or you will die. I do not know when I am going to die. Some of the people in Virginia would like to see me die most any time. But when I do retire, my hobby will be to visit every national park in the United States, and then in Canada and then in foreign lands. I am going to walk as long as I can, and when I can't walk, I am going to ride, and when I can't ride, I am going to get a helicopter. And I hope that Director Wirth will let me land somewhere. These helicopters must be good things because you can sit down most any place.

Now when I was sixteen years old I began to make regular visits to Stoneyland—that is what Skyland used to be called 51 years ago. Now Skyland is part of the Shenandoah National Park. George Pollock, owner of Skyland, was a very remarkable character. He deserves, I think, more credit for the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park than any other one man. There are many people who contributed to the effort which we made in those days, but he loved the place and he did his best to leave a heritage of goodwill and wholesome pleasure. He had his peculiarities, as all of us have. One was that he used to start out about six o'clock in the morning on a horse and blow a bugle in front of every one of the twenty or more cottages he owned as a signal for the guests to get up and go out to see the sunrise. And he liked rattlesnakes. One of the last things he did before the Government took over the park was to come into the dining room one night with a rattlesnake around his neck and the snake would never bite him.

When I took office as the Governor of Virginia in 1926, I made one of my main objectives the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park. A great deal of work had been done by that time. Hubert Work was then Secretary of the Interior—and a very good man he was. The Appalachian Park Commission which selected the Shenandoah in the Blue Ridge and the Great Smoky Mountain National Park further South, consisted of Representative H. W. Temple, William C. Gregg, Harlan P. Kelsey, Col. Glenn Smith and Major William A. Welch. Stephen T. Mather, the first Director, was still serving the national parks and a very fine man he was. That was in 1928, when things were fairly prosperous. I recommended an appropriation of one million dollars and the General Assembly of Virginia adopted the measure. We could not secure the purchase of the properties immediately because there were 2,200 different parcels of land that had to be bought, so the money remained in the Treasury. And then the depression came along in 1930–31, and, when they learned about this million dollars lying idle there were people who wanted to get this money out of the Treasury for other purposes. We had a terrible time trying to hold on to that money. With the help of the Governor who succeeded me we kept this million dollars lying idle for about five years of the depression. I think that was quite an achievement. And then I was chairman of the Citizens that raised nearly a million dollars more. And thus we purchased the Shenandoah National Park, comprising 211,615 acres. In 1954, Director Wirth says that we had 1,659,564 visitors. Most of them were on the Skyline Drive, but nevertheless they saw the park. We really have a great park in the Shenandoah.

I remember when we started to condemn the land, George Pollock called up the Governor's office and called me in Richmond and reported that oak timber was being cut in the park. The people who owned the land, although we had started condemnation proceedings, were cutting the timber. I got in an automobile at once and got hold of the sheriff and we went up there and stopped the cutting of timber. There are logs there today still lying where they fell. But we stopped what would have been great damage to the park.

I have spent a great deal of time in Shenandoah National Park. I know every peak and know every trail. I am a member of the Potomac Appalachian Trail Club. That's an organization that everyone in this area should join. You will be interested to know that Club members keep up sections of the trail. My friends and I have about three or four miles of trail we keep up every year. We cut the weeds and whatever is necessary to be done.

In 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt, came to the Shenandoah National Park to dedicate the first CCC camp. I was driving with him along part of the Skyline Drive and pointed out a road that had been built by Mr. Hoover to his camp. And I suggested to the President

that it would be a very fine idea to connect up the Great Smoky National Park with the Shenandoah on top of the Blue Ridge by a Skyline Drive. Mr. Roosevelt was always responsive to the suggestion to spend money, so he said: "Harry, that is a fine idea, but we ought to start up in New England." That was a good idea on his part, too, but I found out later that when he made overtures to the New England people and the Governors for the drive to start up there, provided they would furnish the right-of-way, they did not respond. But then he said to me: "You and Secretary Ickes (who was along that day) get the right-of-way and I will assign some of this money that has been given to me to spend (I think it was some two or three billion dollars at that time) to start construction of the Skyline Drive". So Secretary Ickes appointed me Chairman of the Committee to secure the right-of-way. It had to be gotten in three States—Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee. So we got the right-of-way—a thousand feet in width, I think, was required, and the States paid for the land. Now the Blue Ridge Parkway is nearly completed—358 miles, leaving 118 miles still to be built. We have spent some 42 million dollars on it. In 1954, some 4,344,000 people traveled over the Blue Ridge Parkway, according to Director Wirth. And it is one of the finest parkway drives we have. I hope that all who have not seen it will travel over it.

Now, with the exception of Stephen Mather, I have known all of the National Park Directors intimately and I have read all that I could about the great work of Stephen Mather. When I was in Glacier Park last year, I saw a plaque dedicated to him recognizing that he laid the foundation of the National Park Service and found and established the policies under which its areas are being developed and conserved unimpaired for future generations. There will never come an end to the good that he has done and no better tribute could be paid to any man than on that plaque which I understand is placed in other parks.

I knew Horace Albright well and Arno Cammerer and Newton Drury and I now know intimately and have a great affection and admiration for our good friend, Conrad Wirth. The best compliment I can say for him is that he has performed his duties as National Park Director in the very finest tradition of the Park Service. His efforts have made possible the great enjoyment of millions of Americans who are now visiting our national parks. Though I have had occasion at times to make some criticism of the personnel of the Federal Government, I have been amazed at the fine type of people who serve in the National Park Service. The rangers, wherever you go (to the Glacier National Park, if you please, or the Shenandoah) represent the finest type of American citizenship. It is a real inspiration to me to come into contact with them,—always polite, always anxious to render a service, and at the same time requiring everyone to obey the laws. Director Wirth and I have a date in Glacier Park this summer and I am going to see what

kind of a walker he is. We are going up to a place where we shall have to walk ten miles to get there. I frequently have walked that far in the Shenandoah. When I was in Glacier Park last year I was told that even the Canadians admitted that Glacier was equal to any of the Canadian Parks. I have seen the Canadian Parks and that is a real admission. Going-to-the-Sun Highway in Glacier is one of the greatest sights in the whole world. Jack Emmert, the Superintendent of Glacier National Park, was born within 20 miles of where I live. His brother was a great friend of mine and he represents to me the very ideal of what a man should be as a park superintendent. He and Superintendent Guy Edwards of Shenandoah National Park are the finest type of public servants.

When I was in Glacier Park, I met a very kind lady who took me around the McDonald Hotel and converted me to the idea that they ought to have some money for repairs and to put in a power plant. I had never in my whole 22 years in the Senate written a letter asking the Director of the Budget to make an appropriation, but this lady made such an impression on me that when I got back to Washington I wrote the Budget Director a personal letter and said that this is the first time I have ever asked for an appropriation and that this request is not for my State but for the Glacier National Park and I thought the McDonald Hotel needed these improvements. I understand that the appropriation will be made.

There is a movement on foot now which menaces the most valuable parts of Glacier National Park by damming up the North Fork of the Flathead River, flooding nearly 20,000 acres—10,000 of it virgin timber where now deer, elk and buffalo are grazing. So far as I know the rule of reason must prevail in arriving at conclusions, but I think that the burden of proof must rest very strongly on those who desire to destroy our great natural resources.

I recently voted to delete Echo Park from the Upper Colorado River project. I was in the fight years ago about the Jackson Hole project. These resources threatened by destruction are for the Government to protect. Other sites can be found for dams, but when you destroy great naturally beautiful scenery, all the money of Rockefeller and everybody else combined *cannot* put it back.

Just the other day I read a book entitled *Hunting and Extraordinary Adventures of Theodore Roosevelt*. It has just been published and I recommend it for good reading. President Roosevelt wrote eloquently about the charm of the wilderness. Let us never forget, ladies and gentlemen, that the strength of America is at home. It is in our plains and our mountains, in our farms and gardens, in our great national parks and our wealth of natural resources. Americans would be better citizens and live longer and happier if they spent time in our national parks. When we strengthen American citizens we strengthen America, because in the final analysis our strength is in the spirit of our citizens.

The Record of Congress in Protecting Our National Parks

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR, Member
U. S. House of Representatives from Pennsylvania

THE Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs are made up so predominately of representatives and senators from the West that I consider it a distinct honor to be invited to take part in this important Conference. Because most of the vast park areas are located in the Rocky Mountain region, the general populace has a tendency to overlook the fact that all of us are responsible for the preservation and maintenance of these great landmarks. Actually, nowhere in our land are there more important and more symbolic National Monuments than the three in the confines of my home State of Pennsylvania—Gettysburg, Valley Forge and Independence Hall.

Perhaps the distance to our larger park systems is largely responsible for the inadequate attention given by Congress in this regard. Otherwise it is quite unlikely that the neglect (and the encroachments on National Park Service policies which have become so pronounced over the years) would be tolerated.

Because this audience is so familiar with the problems, I shall forego examples of the several obvious types of dereliction with which Congress must be charged in its attitude toward our National Parks and Monuments. In the first place, Congress has been negligent in the granting of provisions for dams, use permits, mining, and logging within national monument areas. This instance is all too obvious to those of us who have followed closely the persistent trend of these encroachments.

Congress has also been negligent in not providing sufficient funds for the outright purchase of all property within the boundaries of our National Parks and Monuments. This illogical frugality has encouraged practices that acquire needless outlays far in excess of whatever amount would have been necessary under a *planned* investment policy.

Finally, Congress has been negligent in not requiring either the Park Service, a Committee of Congress, or another Government agency to conduct an overall survey of National Parks and Monuments with an eye to determining conditions and needs in the light of increased use over the past fifteen years. When I was home in Johnstown over the past week-end, a friend looked at me in disbelief as I explained to him that Yellowstone Park still has the same road system that served the stagecoach. But it is no exaggeration. Those were the days when visitors went to the park to stay for a month or so. They were met at the train by a stagecoach and taken around the Loop, stopping overnight along the way, and finally returning to the railroad station four weeks later. In those days perhaps fifty thousand persons visited Yellowstone each

year. Now there are almost two million visitors per annum, almost all traveling in their own automobiles, yet there are no new routes and there has been no resolute effort to learn whether an expanded—or at least an improved—road system would be more satisfactory. I am sure that it would be, and so is everyone else who has visited Yellowstone in recent years, but thus far there has been no provision for such a study.

Perhaps it is not all the fault of Congress. I am reminded of an old fellow who lived in the Ozarks and had never been outside Missouri. He always wanted to see Washington, but he was a truck farmer and just couldn't afford such a trip. Finally several of his wealthier customers got together some cash and bought their old friend a round-trip ticket to the Nation's Capital. They put him on the train and, a week later, were at the station to welcome him back home. "How did you like Washington?" was the first question put to him. And the old fellow very honestly replied: "Well, to tell you the truth, there was so much going on down to the depot that I never did get up to the village."

We have had numerous Commissions, Study Groups, Advisory Councils, and Special Committees operating in the Federal Government elsewhere than on Capitol Hill over the past two decades, but no one ever got around to proposing an appraisal of our park situation. Fortunately, a survey is finally going to come about. MISSION 66 will be conducted without any special funds, and I think that the Director of the National Park Service is to be commended for this step in the right direction. Our National Parks and Monuments will become more accessible to a growing part of our population in the succeeding years. Gradually the new concept of vacations for everyone in all occupations and in all industries, is taking hold and the parks are where more and more of our people will want to go. You would be surprised at the many, many men, women, and children from back in my home District who have visited at least one of these recreational sites, and of course thousands more are dreaming of the day when such a trip will be possible. I consider it the solemn duty of Congress to facilitate park travel and accommodations wherever possible and practicable. Our people can no longer spend a month traveling around the Loop in Yellowstone, but with modern conveyances they will see just as much and more if they are not handicapped by a nineteenth-century roads system.

I also consider it the solemn duty of Congress to preserve our Parks and Monuments against the continued attempts to infringe upon this sacred land, and I use the word 'sacred' advisedly. At the present time there are at least four bills that not only threaten to mar or destroy vast portions of our park areas, but would also establish precedents for the eventual destruction of the whole intent of the National Park Act of 1916. I am opposing these undesirable and expensive measures, and I hope that members of this audience will make every effort to solicit the influence of their friends and neighbors in the crusade against all such

proposals. Here are the Bills to which I refer:

One—The Colorado River Storage Project, which would invade Dinosaur National Monument with two dams—Echo Park and Split Mountain. This is the \$1,600,000 Park Destruction Program which has just passed the Senate.

Two—The Bridge Canyon Dam, which would invade the entire National Grand Canyon National Monument and would back water into Grand Canyon National Park.

Three—Tuolumne Water District No. Two, which would invade Yosemite National Park for a power drop to create electricity. Here let me say that the people who are behind this project can get all the electricity they want by buying coal and using it in steam plants. Just the way that the Potomac Electric Company is doing and just the way that our Public Utility Companies are doing back in Western Pennsylvania. The West has enough coal to last more than a thousand years, and after that we'll be glad to ship it in from Central Pennsylvania, if necessary!

Four—A Bill calling for an annual appropriation of Sixty Million Dollars for planning and developing airport facilities—twenty-five percent of which would be available for projects within National Parks, National Monuments, and National Forests.

Watch these Bills. Be careful of them. Each of them constitutes a menace to the inheritance of our people.

To those who have never absorbed the beauty and inspiring majesty of the National Parks and Monuments, taking arms against invaders might appear to be a thankless task. Members of Congress who take our position, have been subjected to harsh criticism from many sides. One of my good friends from the West recently said sarcastically that he assumes we will next want to put fences around all our parks and require the public to walk through them. Of a certainty, this method would be the most effective way of preserving our parks. But we are reasonable people. We would not object to an encroachment of our landmarks if the National Defense or the National Welfare were involved. If the time comes that our Military Services require establishment of an uranium mine in the middle of our most scenic Monument, we will not stand in the way. If the time comes that all our arable lands are developed to maximum capacity and there is still a shortage of food, we will lend our services to plowing up the ellipse and the mall.

But there are no such emergencies on the farthest horizon, and we challenge the usurpers of the properties that have been set aside for us to become better acquainted with some of the natural wonderlands that God has created so purposefully. Man does not live by bread alone. His soul starves for the soft comfort which only Nature's Grandeur can offer.

My father took me to visit my first National Park when I was a boy

of twelve. That experience was one which has remained with me through the years. On each subsequent trip I have received the same inner satisfaction, and now this inspiration is shared by my children. I hope to give them an opportunity to visit our National Parks and Monuments just as long as they are willing to spend their vacations with their Mom and Dad.

I want to protect the National Parks and Monuments so that our children's children will also have an opportunity to see the handiwork that God has left for them to enjoy. If these magic landmarks remain available to the growing numbers of our people who want to indulge the magnificent testimonials to the Divine Being, I feel confident that there will be a marked decline in the numbers of disbelievers in the generations to follow.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The upper Colorado River bill finally passed Congress and became Public Law 485 on April 11, 1956. The Act omits Echo Park dam and provides that "It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument." The three other bills mentioned have not been passed by the 84th Congress.

IN THE STATES

PRESENTED AT THE 35TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS, HELD AT
STOWE, VERMONT, SEPTEMBER 25-29, 1955.

Safety Program for State Parks

POLK HEBERT, Board Member, Louisiana State Parks and Recreation Commission
Member, New Orleans Chapter, American Society of Safety Engineers

WE READ, see and hear the word Safety or Accident Preventions so frequently that I feel that we have accepted these words to the extent that they are not meant for us but only for the masses. In fact, we have gotten so close to the forest that we cannot see the trees; we see these words so frequently, they have lost some of their meaning, therefore, we should back off and approach this from a different view.

Last month one of the major parks in the city of New Orleans was the scene of the death of a fourteen-year-old youngster. This was termed an accident in newspaper headlines, but—let us analyze this so-called accident.

"LIFEGUARD SHOCKED, BOY KILLED. . . . Police revealed Saturday that an Audubon Park lifeguard nearly lost his life trying to save a fourteen-year-old, electrocuted when he fell on a charged plate at the pool. Killed instantly Friday night was John Stanley. Badly shocked when he tried to pull Stanley's inert form from the metal plate was lifeguard Almond Smith. Police said the plate covered a brick-enclosed electrical junction box next to the walkway around the pool. George Douglas, Park Superintendent, said Saturday that homicide detectives and a city electrical inspector remained at the pool until 12:40 A.M. Saturday investigating the accident. 'The cause of it was a wire inside the junction box that touched the metal plate,' Douglas said. 'It was sending 110 volts through the plate—enough to throw a person's hand away ordinarily.' He said that the Stanley boy fell across the plate, however, and that being wet from swimming, he was immediately grounded.

Police were told by eye-witnesses that Stanley had walked over to the area of the junction box when he suddenly stiffened. He fell across the metal plate covering the junction box, according to Police Patrolmen Anthony Ragusa and Frank Cefalu. When lifeguard Smith attempted to pull the body from the plate, he was thrown back by the electricity and shocked, the policemen reported. Arthur Arseneaux, 17, of 2136 Cadiz, head lifeguard, succeeded in removing the body by pulling it off the plate with a towel, police said. Stanley, a seventh grade Wright High School student, was pronounced dead by a Charity Hospital ambulance doctor at 8:15 P.M. Police crash truck crewmen and the Charity doctor worked unsuccessfully for about twenty minutes in efforts to revive the boy."

Was this really an accident, or was it due to the lack of training on the part of employees not to leave a hazardous condition which might cause injury? Let us approach this obligation: from a basis of education and training of personnel; from examination of conditions which cause injury; and from a study of preventative methods for controlling hazardous conditions which expose the living to injury.

We must set up a Training Program: (a) Procedure and;

(b) Method: Secure services of trained specialist to instruct key personnel. These can be secured from large industrial manufacturing plants or utility companies, your local chapter of the American Society of Safety Engineers or the National Safety Council.

We should survey requirements as to the type program that will best fit your personnel and problems, and ask these questions:

Do you have maintenance shops with hand and power tools? If you do, then select an industrial plant which has a trained man in the safe operation, care and use of this equipment. Borrow this man to train your key personnel and in turn let them train that part of your organization that will derive the most benefits from this training.

Do you use heavy equipment, draglines, bulldozers, graders, power shovels, snowplows, trucks, etc.? If you do, contact your local heavy equipment dealer for safety information for the proper and safe use of this equipment. (The gamblers, produced by the Caterpillar Tractor Company and furnished through the courtesy of Boyce-Harvey Machinery, Inc., Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Do you have roadway maintenance, nature trails, bridle paths? For the proper and safe maintenance of your roadways, contact your State Highways Department and for information on the maintenance of your nature trails and bridle paths, contact your Municipal Groups and Recreational Program Directors.

Do you have a building maintenance or new construction program? If so, get in touch with the various building suppliers who can furnish you with safety information.

Do you have docks, boats, bathing facilities, pools and other water sports? For information concerning the solution of any problems pertaining to these facilities, contact your American Red Cross, U. S. Coast Guard, Local Power Boat Squadron or U. S. Navy.

Do you have electric, telephone, water, sewer and gas distribution systems? The odds are that you will have problems in the proper functioning of one or more of these facilities. For an answer to your problem, contact your local Public Utilities Company, Telephone Company, Gas Company, Water Works Association, the Sewerage and Sanitation Board or your local State Health Authorities.

We must set up an Inspection Program with a check system: This has been successfully accomplished by a classification and inspection which might be termed "How to Make an Inspection." First it is advisable to make a check list of the things to be inspected. To accomplish this to the best advantage and for the inspector to give a complete inspection, he should use all five of his senses if possible.

He should *Look* for signs of poor housekeeping, poor maintenance, inadequate tools, unsuitable equipment, etc.

He should *Listen* for sounds of escaping gas or water. *Listen* for unusual sounds like thumps, squeaks or squeals.

He should *Feel* for equipment or machinery that is vibrating unnecessarily. *Feel* for sharp points or edges that may cut or tear. *Feel* for rigidity.

He should *Smell* for odors of leaking natural gas, acetylene gas, spilled gasoline or other explosive gases or liquids.

He should *Taste* the purity of drinking water, soft drink dispensers, coffee urns, or drinking fountains.

He should review in advance of an inspection a list of possible mechanical or physical hazards which may be found during the inspection, then follow the inspection check list whenever it is possible to do so.

He should follow the inspection process whenever it is possible to do so. This applies primarily to grounds and buildings.

It is unwise to attempt to correct unsafe working practices which may be observed while making an inspection. Instead, bring them to the attention of the proper supervisor, foreman or superintendent after the inspection has been completed, because you want to avoid disturbing or distracting those at work. They might injure themselves if startled or distracted. A good inspector is an unobtrusive person.

The typical inspection list which has been successfully used for buildings, lodges, cabins and group camps is as follows:

BUILDINGS, LODGES, CABINS AND GROUP CAMPS

1. Check foundations of buildings.
2. Check piers under buildings.
3. Check sills and other foundation for evidence of termites, dampness and dry rot.
4. Check grades under buildings for moisture accumulation.
5. Check foundation walls for cracks.
6. Check all pipes exposed under building, drains, gas line, sewer and water lines.
7. Check all concrete walls and drains and clean outs.
8. Check outside paint for peeling, mildew and damaged surface.
9. Check all screen windows and doors.
10. Check all glasses in doors, windows, and outside openings.
11. Check condition of glass and glazing on each window.
12. Check condition of roof, drains and valleys for accumulation of leaves or other obstructions, flashing around chimneys and windows.
13. Check louvers for accumulation of bird nests and other obstructions.
14. Check condition of outside grounds for cleanliness and hazardous conditions such as broken bottles or other harmful objects.
15. Check interior floors.
16. Check interior walls.
17. Check interior ceilings.
18. Check all closet spaces.
19. Check locks on all doors and window hooks and latches.
20. Check furniture, chairs, tables, beds, refrigerators and stoves.
21. Check bathroom, toilet, lavatory, shower, shower curtain, towel rack, linens and general appearances.
22. Check all wiring and light fixtures inside and out.

GENERAL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

1. Check for general condition of building inside and outside same as other building inspections.
2. Check storage facilities.
3. Check storage of materials.
4. Check all salvage materials.

GROUNDS

1. Check entire area for hazardous conditions, debris, neglect, protection, and cleanliness.
2. Check all barricades, fences, signs, roads, sewers, water towers, electric and gas system.
3. Check all docks, piers, boats, paddles and hazards on shore line.
4. Check for dead trees near buildings and picnic areas.

EQUIPMENT

1. Check tractors, trucks and automotive equipment.
2. Check all hand tools, power tools as to condition and use.
3. Check stock of materials on hand.
4. Check mileage on automotive equipment.
5. Report all damaged and obsolete equipment.

This inspection should be made on a monthly basis with the inspector furnishing a copy to the foreman or park superintendent who in turn will initial one copy and mail to his supervisor as indicated on the organizational chart.

As a further check to determine that this inspection has been completed, a supplementary inspection sheet should be furnished the Supervisory Inspector, Engineer or Assistant Park Director who will classify the general overall conditions of each area.

Sufficient records should be maintained in the Administrative Office and the inspection sheets should be of such a nature that they can be perforated and indexed so that each area will be set up as a separate unit and can be referred to immediately for ready reference or discussion with the superintendent or individual involved. The success of this system must not be handed to the operating personnel as a packaged unit but must be discussed at length in your monthly or quarterly meetings of your supervisors so that they will be given an opportunity to accept or reject this system in their particular categories.

Frankly, this is a selling job for the top management of your organization to your operating group. Its success is dependent upon the acceptance of the operating personnel. As an incentive plan for securing outstanding operation, an award to attend sectional, regional or national safety conferences to further their interest can be offered as an inducement. There are many benefits derived from this type of program which effect your entire operating personnel. It brings forth a closer spirit of cooperation among employees, it brings suggestions which heretofore have not been forthcoming and it brings forth undiscovered talents of individuals who are interested but unable to express themselves. The

cost of this whole program is far outweighed by its benefits. As a comparison, industry on a national scale has set this up as one of their top objectives in the successful operation of their business.

Now to complete your records, it would create a competitive spirit for the successful development of your program to set up some type of report system on lost time accidents compared to man hours worked. This should be kept as a yardstick to measure your success. You should not have more than ten injuries per million man hours worked.

Set up a Hazard Operation Plan: A Hazard Operation Plan is merely a suggestion system from the operating personnel. It is a system whereby they may express themselves on shortcuts, hazardous conditions, efficiency of operation, suggested accomplishments, suggested objectives, suggested future planning or in plain words, a system whereby you would get suggestions from your entire operating personnel to make your little world a better place in which to live. This system should be devised to meet your particular requirements.

What is your liability for protection against negligence on the part of your park operation? Naturally employees of your system are protected under Workmen's Compensation Laws; But, what is the general using public's protection against accidents?

The following, which is an excerpt from a New Orleans newspaper concerning the accidental electrocution mentioned earlier, shows what type of damages that can actually result from a serious accident.

"Ask \$150,900 in Pool death . . . A suit asking damages of \$150,900 was filed today in Federal District Court by the parents of a 15-year-old boy who was electrocuted Aug. 19 at the Audubon Park Swimming Pool.

"The suit was filed by Mrs. Clara Louise Sanford and her former husband, Joseph Lawrence Stanley. It is against the Travelers Insurance Company, insurers of the park.

"It is alleged that on August 19 John Lawrence Stanley was walking on a concrete walk adjacent to the pool and within the pool enclosure when he came in contact with a live wire protruding from a junction box.

"It is charged that the wire was not insulated, that there were no warning signs and that employees of the pool knew of the faulty condition for many months prior to the accident.

"The child's mother claims she was partially dependent upon him for support in that he contributed \$40 a month to her support. She is asking \$125,917.94, which includes funeral expenses. The child's father is asking \$25,000 for loss of the child's companionship."

On behalf of the state of Louisiana, on behalf of those people who use the facilities of park areas, on behalf of all of you who devote your lives to the successful operation of your particular area or function, this program is dedicated to the years of success that I know lie in store for you who have given unselfishly of your time, effort and thought in making the recreational and educational facilities of this nation a safer place in which we, the general public, can enjoy our leisure hours.

National Forests and Recreation in the Northeast

GERALD S. WHEELER, Supervisor, White Mountain National Forest,
Laconia, N. H.

SOME of you come from Western States that have had national forests since before the turn of the century. You know that they were set aside from the public domain and that many of them are still remote and rather inaccessible. While there are national forests in 38 States some of you may not know that it was not until 1911 that the national forest program spread to the East. That year, as the result of legislation introduced by a Senator from Massachusetts, the Week's Law was passed providing for the purchase of land for national forests at the headwaters of navigable rivers primarily for watershed protection. This same law also recognized that forest fire control was a joint responsibility of State and Federal Governments. In the East, where there was no public domain, the national forests had to be purchased from private land owners and for that reason they are often known as the purchased or Week's Law national forests. Those in the West are often called the public domain national forests. Over one-half of the 38 states having national forests are Week's Law States. The majority of the acreage purchased for these eastern national forests was land that had been heavily cut over or burned and in many cases consisted of what might well be called waste land. This is in contrast to the many millions of acres of virgin timber set aside for the public domain forests.

Since 1905, when the U. S. Forest Service was established in its present form, the national forests have been managed under the policy then established by Secretary of Agriculture Wilson. He told Gifford Pinchot, the first Chief of the Forest Service, that he wanted the national forests so administered that they would provide the most productive use for the permanent good of the whole people and not for the temporary benefit of individuals or companies. He also stressed that where conflicting interests concerning the use of the forests had to be reconciled, that the questions would always be decided from the standpoint of the greatest good to the greatest number in the long run. This is still the aim of the Forest Service in the administration of the national forests and is the basis for the multiple use system of management. National forests are not single purpose enterprises but rather are managed for many purposes; all involving use. Over the years it has been well demonstrated that large portions of national forests can be *used* at the same time for several different purposes; *multiple use*. But more about that later.

Now while I was for many years Supervisor of the Green Mountain National Forest here in Vermont, I am presently in charge of the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire and Maine. These are both outstanding forests in the greatest public land system in the

world. I think that it is particularly appropriate that the national forests are represented on your program as 1955 is the Golden Anniversary of the U. S. Forest Service.

Vermont and New Hampshire compete back and forth across Connecticut for many things including the recreation dollar. While New Hampshire's National Forest may be a bit older and is some larger, Vermonters will readily point out that their national forest is much more productive and far more beautiful. Now this feeling is entirely a friendly one and I know that our hosts will be reconciled, even if not happy, if I tell you something about the White Mountain National Forest as long as I stress their feeling, that anything good about it is much better in Vermont.

The White Mountain National Forest is located in north-central New Hampshire and Western Maine and comprises 723,000 acres of mountainous country. It was one of the first national forests to be purchased under the Weeks Law and many people feel that the need for a national forest in New Hampshire was the primary reason for its passage. Perhaps 723,000 acres doesn't mean much to some of you, so to obtain a sharper picture you might have in mind that it is larger than the State of Rhode Island and is the largest area of public land in New England. It comprises the upland tributaries of four great New England rivers, the Merrimack, Connecticut, Androscoggin and Saco. It includes all of the peaks of the Presidential Range and 6,288 foot high Mt. Washington which is the highest peak in the Northeast.

Well, what kind of land is included in this $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million acre national forest? Let's look at our land use plans. For one thing, about 220,000 acres have been classified as mountain top or ridge top and include such land types as barren, sub-alpine and considerable quantities of upper slope spruce. This zone includes all of the Presidential Range above timber line.

Then 400,000 acres has been classified as lower slope and it supports the best timber types, has the deepest soils and probably stores the most water. It grows the most, the best and the most accessible timber, produces and carries most of the game and fur bearing animals and includes most of the productive and usable fishing waters. Because of its accessibility by roads and trails it carries most of the mass recreation and by being so important for so many activities, is the area that presents the greatest *potential* conflict between uses.

Now between this lower slope area and the mountain tops we have a third area consisting of about 100,000 acres that we call an intermediate zone. For the most part it includes the lower portions of the high spruce slopes which, by a combination of accessibility and productivity, are considered suitable for commercial forest management. It also is important for water production and storage as well as for certain types of recreation.

The determination of these divisions was a basic step in land use planning. The results stressed the limitations of resource management in the mountain top and intermediate zones that comprise about 320,000 acres or 45 percent of the total, and emphasized the opportunities for such management in the lower slope zone containing the remaining 55 percent or 400,000 acres. I am going to use this lower slope zone to give you a quick idea as to how we manage more than one resource on the same area under the multiple use system. For the sake of brevity I am going to drop all of the many diversified activities we have on the Eastern national forests, into 3 classes that I will call water, timber and recreation. Actually they represent far more than three types of use.

If I were asked to list these three resource groups in the order of their importance, I would place water at the top of the list without any hesitation. It would not be so easy however for me to designate the one of second importance. Actually, timber production and recreation are of about equal importance on my forest under the present scheme of things and it would be very difficult to classify one above the other. However, for the sake of continuity, I am going to put timber management second and recreation third. What are the relative importance of these three resources in our New England economy and what are their potential values?

In the first place the forest is of tremendous importance as an upland reservoir for 4 of our large New England rivers. In addition, 41 communities, hotels and resorts obtain part or all of their water from the national forest. In most cases the national forest supplies these communities with water that can be used with only a minimum of chlorination and which can flow to the faucets by gravity. One of these communities has a population of 17,000. No one knows how much the national forests are worth as a major source of water for industries and communities. I have seen various estimates prepared by competent authorities and the values they placed are very high. Dollars may well be a poor measuring stick when it comes to water, as it is something we *have* to have and is worth whatever it takes to get it. Its value today is undoubtedly very small compared to what it will be in the years ahead. And yet while 110,000 acres or about 28 percent of the lower slope zone, our most accessible and productive type, is contained in watersheds for these 41 communities, we still find it possible to manage the other 2 resource groups on this same area at the same time without serious conflicts. Let me explain:

As I have already pointed out I have temporized a bit by designating timber production as the second most important resource. While it will be many years before all of the abused and wrecked stands comprising the White Mountain National Forest again become productive, it is still possible to harvest nominal amounts of mature timber each year. Our annual cut averages 15 million board feet and has a stumpage

value in excess of \$150,000. These amounts will increase steadily as the stands recover and become more productive. Possibly, 15 million board feet does not mean too much to some of you but I think that it will when I tell you that the costs of processing probably exceeds 3 million dollars each year. Another way of expressing 15 million board feet is that if this volume of timber were put into building materials it would represent enough material for about 1500 houses. And yet, under the multiple use system of management the areas that produce water for community and industrial use can also produce part of this timber economy. As a general rule good timber management is good water management. So here we have two major resources being managed on the same area and compatible with one another.

Now the third resource I mentioned is recreation and I suppose you wonder if we are successful in blending it in with timber production and water production. Yes, we are doing it on most areas and even in the lower slope zone, with a minimum of conflicts. To be sure we refrain from cutting timber along roads, trails, brooks, ponds and heavily used areas as well as in the upper slope forests so important in watershed management.

We locate our camping and picnic areas away from watersheds supplying domestic water to communities but we cut timber on these watersheds and hunting, fishing and hiking are now pretty much the accepted thing.

Recreational use is growing by leaps and bounds and it is a year-long use. The White Mountain National Forest has about every conceivable type of forest recreation and it is enjoyed by over 4 million people every year. For instance, we have 40 fishing ponds and lakes having a combined area of 2500 acres. There are 641 miles of fishing stream and 373,000 acres of good hunting cover. Most of this is in the lower slope zone. All that is needed is a state hunting and fishing license to enjoy this form of recreation. The land is not posted. Then, in addition to the 74 miles of state highways and 304 miles of town roads through the national forest, the Forest Service also maintains 140 miles of forest highways and development roads to make the forest more accessible. We maintain around 800 miles of foot trails and there are cooperating trail organizations, such as the Randolph Mountain Club, which maintain an additional 550 miles. The Forest Service maintains 11 miles of ski trails and the spring skiing Mecca of the east, Tuckerman Ravine, is located in the Presidential Range area. Here skiing continues through the spring and usually well into June. Many days in the spring up to 2,000 skiers climb the $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles to enjoy this last skiing of the year. We operate 19 camping and picnic areas the largest being Dolly Copp Campground at the foot of Mt. Washington where facilities are available for about 800 campers but where we have had 1,500 at peak periods. The Forest Service maintains 5 high country cabins and 18 trailside

shelters in the back country and high in the mountains along the network of hiking trails. Cooperating trail clubs, such as the Appalachian Mountain Club maintain an additional 23 trailside shelters and this same organization also maintains, under Forest Service permit, its chain of 10 mountain huts along the trails in the high peaks where food and lodging can be obtained for a nominal price during the hiking season. And then, of course, we have the hundreds and thousands of people who just come to the White Mountains to view the majestic peaks and the green timbered hills. These folks take their recreation in a rather sedentary manner but each year they number between 3 and 4 million.

Recreation is big business in the White Mountains where the gross income from recreation has been estimated by a state agency as exceeding \$50,000,000. Including the national forest, this White Mountain area provides 40 percent of the State's recreational income. Recreation is New Hampshire's number two business, but, we should have in mind that so far as the National Forest is concerned, it is secondary in importance to water production and certainly not more important than timber production. And let us not lose sight of that fact that under the multiple use system of management we have these three major resources living together in a reasonably harmonious family group and with a minimum of domestic problems. It would not be difficult to put a price tag on the value of the forest for timber production but it would be nearly impossible for water production. We might be able to put a price tag on its value for recreation but I am not sure that I could defend it. We do know that regardless of present-day values as our population continues to grow, the importance and value of all three of these resources will continue to increase. There is little likelihood of our increasing materially the area of public land in New England. Somebody told me the other day that the White Mountains are now within a day's motor trip for some 35 or 40 million people. In evaluating the recreational potential of New England, the White Mountain and Green Mountain National Forests should be given places near the head of the table. And let us not lose sight of the fact that under this multiple-use system of management they offer the public one of the best means for providing mass recreation at a nominal cost to the taxpayer.

In closing I would like to pay my respects to Perry Merrill the Director of Vermont Department of Forests and Parks who has been a close friend of mine for many years. He is a firm advocate of the informal type of forest recreation that is so popular here in the Northeast. He has been the same gracious host at this conference that he is yearlong to the many visitors to Vermont's recreation areas.

Design Problems—Artificial Bathing Areas

L. L. HUTTLESTON, Assistant Director of State Parks, Albany, New York

A. Bathing, or rather beach recreation, is still the prime attraction in a park. It is difficult enough to incorporate any water surface or shore line in a park, at cost that can be afforded. To find one with adequate safe natural water for high capacity bathing use is rare indeed. In New York State, blessed with a variety of shore lines, new development or redevelopment of state parks since World War II has involved four completely artificial pools, with at least three more in immediate planning stages. Contrastingly only four new areas involve natural water surfaces. Three of them are on the Great Lakes, cursed with short seasons, storms and uncertain bathing conditions.

B. Such artificial developments are costly. We have reached a rather empiric conclusion that it is hardly worth building a pool development in a state park with less than 8,000 sq. feet of water surface. In round figures such a pool with minimum matching bathhouse, toilets and utilities, costs \$200,000. From this minimum, costs range up to nearly \$2,000,000 for the new Anthony Wayne development in Harri-man Park.

The sad part of this is not the costs themselves, but the fact that we can still accommodate only relatively trivial numbers of people. Pools don't "stretch" for the big days like natural beaches. Space limits, safety and regulations control capacity right down to the man—giving us the unpleasant situation of people driving up to fifty miles for a swim and waiting in line for hours. We have small natural beaches up-state, where the whole waterfront development did not cost \$100,000, that can take care of a bigger beach crowd on a given instant than you can run through Anthony Wayne all day.

C. The fact is that the artificial pool, as presently designed and conceived, is an urban facility. It fits best with public transport and the bicycle trade. As a tool to cope with the typical state park recreation problem, diverse, low tension, family group activity; it is at best a transplanted exotic and at worst a monstrosity.

At the beginning, I distinguished between bathing and beach recreation. It is a real distinction. The lure of the water, as such, is largely illusion. We have become a nation of sun-worshippers. Several years ago, we ran a check on some of our up-state beaches. Generally there was about one person actually in the water to every seven who were sun-bathing or lolling around in bathing dress. In dealing with this kind of recreation load, the artificial pool fails dismally.

D. The bathhouse is not vanishing from the scene, but clothing and living habits are affecting its design and capacity factors. More and more of our people live in suburban areas where casual clothes are the rule, days, nights and Sundays. Our most respectable citizens

gallivant around in clothes that they wouldn't have worn in their own back yard thirty years ago. Quick drying and self-pressing fabrics contribute to these habits. As a result, the bathhouse is not only dropping in capacity relative to bathing loads, but it can well use baskets and parcel size lockers instead of more elaborate equipment.

What is the answer? We still must have the artificial bathing area. In many locations, a park is literally not a park without it.

I am beginning to think the problem is almost a pure research job, calling for the co-operative ingenuity of park administrators, designers and public health regulatory agencies. We need to escape from the urban swimming pool stereotype. The ideal is artificiality of necessity, but high capacity as equally essential; some simulation of natural surroundings and a minimum of structural intrusion; recognition that 80% to 90% of your crowd needn't be in the water at all at any given instant; and simplification of bathhouse and accessory design to meet modern standards of demand.

JOHN I. ROGERS, Chief, Section of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Parks and Recreation Division—Michigan Department of Conservation

CONSTRUCTION of swimming pools or artificial bathing areas may be the solution to the lack of swimming facilities in some areas. A great number of the States, however, need not turn to this type of facility with its limited capacity. There are two other possibilities open to every State that has rivers, creeks, and lakes. One is to modify the shore and lake bottom of existing lakes to make them suitable for swimming. The other is to create new lakes by impounding waters of rivers and creeks and developing beaches ahead of impounding the water.

Next to swimming probably the second greatest public demand is for picnic facilities. Picnickers also want to be near the water. Picnicking and swimming invariably go together in a state park development and creating new lakes or modifying existing lakes opens up the possibility of providing facilities for both. Construction of a swimming pool provides for a limited number of swimmers but it does not provide the water attraction that is desired by the picnicker.

Seldom will it be possible, through creation of new lakes or modifying existing lake shores, to develop a Jones Beach but it will be possible to create hundreds of beaches that will handle 1,000 to 10,000 people at one time. The cost will be greatly under that of swimming pool construction. Swimming pools will cost \$200 per person capacity of the pool. Lake developments now under construction in Michigan, in one instance which is a Jones Beach type of development, will cost about \$160 per person capacity at one time. Another development, not nearly as pretentious but none the less planned to accommodate about 10,000 people at one time, will cost about \$75 per person capacity at one time.

Essential elements for development of beaches on existing or newly created lakes are: (a) water free from contamination (b) existing gradual sloping of lake bottom from shore or development of such a lake bottom possible (c) constant change of water either through stream current through the lake or sufficient wind action to create movement of water. Beaches should be located on the opposite side of the lake from the prevailing winds. Prevailing winds should blow onto the beach. This gives a washing action on the beach bringing in the cleanest water. A beach with this wind exposure will also have the warmest water, as the surface water, which is the warmest water, is being constantly blown towards the beach.

Comments on Camping in State Parks

STATEMENT OF C. L. HARRINGTON, Superintendent, Forests and Parks Division, Conservation Department, Madison, Wis.

FROM what I gather so far in this meeting which would coincide with the experience in Wisconsin during the past several years, and particularly during the season of 1955, is that camping is taking on a growing significance in state park affairs. This is true particularly at those parks which have attractive water frontage on lakes or rivers and particularly lakes. I don't think it is true for those parks, the features of which are high points or waterfalls on which are places of scientific or historic interest. I would also like to point out that, in my observation, the increase is mainly in the family group category. It has seemed to me that there are more family groups, including a growing number of children, using the public camping areas in the state parks.

Several years ago, along with the other States, the daily fees for camping sites were rather noticeably increased. It was felt that this might have an adverse effect on camping. Our experience is to the effect that such has not been the case. Instead of diminishing, the camping use has increased. On this question of charges no particular well analyzed common denominator pattern for the country as a whole has ever been worked out. Every state arrives at its conclusions depending on what the immediate situation is that confronts administrative agencies. I had thought that I might propose to this group that such a study be made but probably it is just as well that we all work out our own destiny in this respect. We do have the statistics assembled by the National Park Service which are very helpful, and the National Park Service undoubtedly would be the best agency to make a study of camping fees for the country as a whole with conclusions and recommendations, but probably the job is so diverse in nature that it would not be worth while or that after it was done all States

would still find it inadvisable to try and proceed other than they are all now doing. Still the question remains more or less unsolved as to whether present day charges are realistic or actually needed, State by state, or in line with charges or no charges in vogue for other services or facilities furnished the public, all of which cost money the same as camping does.

I presume in other respects our camping use experiences would follow more or less those that all of you have been confronted with—the week-end camper who wants to leave his camp equipment on location during an extended period, even for the entire season; the growing demand for better water and sanitary facilities; the criticisms that arise from freeing water frontage from the rather concentrated use of campers and moving them to areas back from the water frontage itself; the problems that arise from that type of camping that looks like getting a low cost place to live; the decisions that are needed to reconcile the interests of local merchants or salesmen or local service groups from soliciting among campers. With the increase of camping of course these problems and others tend to increase and intensify. During 1955 on several week-ends we had the feeling at some of the camp sites that we were really chock-full. On one night at Devil's Lake State Park, over the Fourth of July week-end, there were over 1,000 camping units registered. This means that a changing aggregation of people of numbers equal to a large village or small city had to be dealt with. Under such circumstances everything in the park, including the area itself, is taxed to the limit. As a result, in the middle of August the camping sites are rather worn out and take on the appearances of a rather beat-up place. Just how these matters can be fairly disposed of is not altogether clear. I am sure we all feel that this use of state park property will increase in the years just ahead and we will all have to do the best we can to serve this public use. In this respect we will have to have the cooperation of those who like the experience of outdoor life to the fullest extent.

Statement by C. P. BRADFORD, State Parks Commission, Augusta, Maine

ACCORDING to the Dictionary there are four definitions for "Camp." They are (1) the ground occupied by an army or other group with tents, or other temporary structures for shelters. (2) a tent or other temporary hut used by sportsmen or motorists. (3) persons in an encampment and (4) military life.

Like all words, it has come to mean different things to different people.

Simplified, to the extreme, John Muir said that all he needed to get ready for a camping expedition was to "throw some tea and bread in an old sack and jump over the back fence."

Today, youngsters, have "day camping" programs where nature is emphasized. Their older brothers and sisters go "camping" in boys and girls summer camps. Available to mother and dad are adult camps for nature study, beauty treatment—and what have you. Also there are camps for training soldiers, ball players and prize fighters.

By combining the first three definitions found in the dictionary, we define camping in state parks to mean groups of people using temporary shelters on a plot of ground designated by the park authorities and provided with certain essential facilities.

Camping facilities is a very controversial subject, and each agency will have to establish its own policies. In the Maine State Park we intend to provide each campsite with a picnic table, a fireplace and reasonably accessible pure drinking water and toilet facilities.

Probably, the fireplace, with the advent of various types of camp stoves is the least essential; although I feel that our modern civilization has developed no substitute for the evening campfire—around which, in the wilds of Wyoming, the National Park idea was conceived.

Our host, Vermont, is to be commended, for providing every State Park area with untreated mountain spring water from its eternal hills.

Of greatest importance are the sanitary facilities. In Maine we have attempted to provide water borne sewerage for the heavy use areas. In the remote, small use areas pit toilets are used—and as long as park use coincides with park design, they have proven satisfactory.

Beyond the fundamental essential four—sanitary facilities, pure drinking water, picnic table and fireplace, there are various interpretive programs and facilities that can be initiated. Interpretive programs explain the park. People enjoy and appreciate what they understand. With understanding comes support.

Director Connie Wirth of the National Park Service has author Freeman Tilden working on a 2-year assignment to re-examine interpretive programs and methods and to make recommendations for parks on all levels.

We have found that nature trails receive much appreciative use. We have been most fortunate in having various garden clubs lay them out and provide the signs.

As our Sebago Lake State Park we have an Arts and Crafts program, which is very much worth while and self supporting from a 15 cent per class fee. Our campground tender has organized it, with the co-operation of interested adults, so that no extra personnel or state funds have been involved.

Working with leather, paper, plastics, etc., the classes met twice a week. (Attendance ran about 40, with children predominating.) The most popular item this summer was a match scratcher modeled after Smokey the Bear.

Also at Sebago Lake we have an amphitheatre where each Wednesday and Saturday evenings campfire programs are scheduled. The Wednesday evening programs have brought some phase of conservation. Twice we turned to our good neighbor New Hampshire and were favored with excellent programs by Dean Stevens of the Forestry School and Larry Rathbun of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

The Saturday evening programs include a popular movie. To this the Central Office agreed reluctantly, but the gains of a quiet night seem, to the Ranger at least, worth while. For it has been shown that for a popular movie the entire camp turns out and then turns in.

Maine must continue to give *camping* careful consideration in its planning program. In 1954 the national average of tent and trailer campers as reported by 81 agencies in 46 States was 8%. In Maine it was 25% or one camper night for every 3 day visitors. I believe this is the highest ratio in the country, and our camping is limited, in most areas, only by the facilities available.

Because of overcrowding at Sebago Lake where the ratio of campers to total park use is 47%, it became necessary to limit parties to the number of sites—224, and a two week limit was established. This resulted in fewer camper nights in 1955, but it more than doubled the individuals who camped at Sebago.

Overcrowding, while very easy to get into, has several detrimental effects. Therefore it is advisable to hold park use to park design. There is, however, the unhappy picture of the travel weary party that arrives just after the last campsite has been filled.

Apparently all the park operators can do is to publicize and advise the governing bodies of the needs and the opportunities existing in the camping field. (In Maine it was believed that this year 525 camping sites should have been added to the existing 400.)

Today we go camping in air conditioned cars propelled with Hi Octane gas, on tubeless tires, over super highways listening to the current ball game or song hit. We take synthetic sleeping bags to lay on air mattresses. We cook over gas flames and keep our food cold in portable refrigerators. Science has provided us with insect bombs, light weight clothing, portable boats and motors, excellent cameras and binoculars, and other things, for our pleasures and comfort.

The art of camping for John Muir and John Doe presents a striking contrast, and yet, I feel that the next generation will have camping equipment that we moderns haven't yet dreamed of.

There are many sociological factors affecting camping.

Living standards have improved 25% in the last 10 years. 70% of U. S. families now own automobiles, and today, one U. S. worker, with power tools turns out as much in a 40 hour week as 3 men could

in 1850 working a 70 hour week. Also in 1850 two-thirds of all U. S. energy was muscle power. In 1950 it was less than 2%.

By 1960, only 5 years hence, the U. S. will probably have 177 million people, a 36½ hour week and an average income of \$6,180. The 4 day week is in the offing. In 1900 13% of living time was working time. Today it's only 9% and the leisure time market has now reached 30 billion annually.

Maine's own naturalist, Henry Beston, has put his finger on one of the fundamental human needs and advantages of camping when he wrote, "people want room to breathe, where one does not have to elbow—or gasp—to remain an individual and a human being."

Super Highways and Parks

JOSEPH F. KAYLOR, Director, Department of Forests and Parks,
Annapolis, Maryland

THE PRESENT DAY trend in super highway construction is creating many new problems in state parks and recreation areas. The new high speed highways are literally dumping thousands of people in the very limited space of parks now available for public use. What are we, as park administrators, to do about this situation?

Many suggestions have arisen how we may go about securing the cooperation of the highway planners in providing us with preliminary plans while the work is in the reconnaissance stage, these with the thought that we might first of all make suggestions how the road entrance and exit may be placed in order to create little traffic hazard difficulties or confusion to the potential state park visitor. We would likewise have an early opportunity, through knowledge of such information, to better plan many of the now limited facilities, so that we could take care of the crowds which are bound to arrive once the super highway is completed. We all recall Colonel Lieber's planning of thirty years ago when state parks were placed geographically so that they would not be more than 25 miles away from each center of population. It seems like a relatively short few years ago that we stepped up the distance to 50 miles from large groups of citizens; then 75 miles; and now today, in amazement, I can report to you that in some areas state park visitors are driving 90 to 100 miles for a day in the parks. This means approximately a 200 mile round-trip in order to have a picnic in one of our state parks or recreation areas. It shows the tremendous need for such outlets, but in showing this need, we in administrative positions must get an early grasp of the problem and change our plans to meet the growing recreation seeking population's thrust upon us.

Roll Call of the States

Alabama. James L. Segrest, Chief, Division of State Parks, Monuments and Historical Sites, Alabama Department of Conservation, reported:

The outlook is bright for Alabama's state parks in the next two years, brighter financially than in any two year period in the history of the State. The State Legislature recently closed a biennial session at Montgomery, approving a State Parks budget of \$486,810 annually for the next two years. This is an increase of approximately \$250,000 per year over the budget of the current year and more than doubles the amount available to the parks system in any previous year. Although the Legislature failed to approve a five-million-dollar general obligation bond issue for development of state parks, administration forces plan to introduce this proposal again in a special legislative session.

During the past year, the Alabama Parks System has created the position of State Parks Field Supervisor. This official, assigned to the Montgomery office, will give closer field supervision and coordination by the central office. The 1955 State Legislature raised the maximum salary of top merit system employees to \$9,000 annually, an increase of \$1,800 per year; increased the maximum subsistence allowance from \$7 to \$9 per day, and private car mileage from 6 cents to 8 cents per mile. The salary ceiling raise will probably increase the pay brackets for most state merit system employees.

Two laws enacted by the 1953 State Legislature gave Alabama's Parks Division royalties from the sale of sand and gravel from public water bottoms and the revenue from sale of timber from parks lands. These two sources will produce approximately \$150,000 for each of the next two years. This revenue can be allocated for any purpose and spent over and above the established budget. However plans are to use these funds for capital improvement which with \$40,000 of the Legislative appropriation earmarked for additions and betterments, will give \$190,000 annually for additions to parks facilities.

Two new public lakes were opened in Alabama during the past year and two others were re-opened after complete renovation. The recent Legislature enacted a general fishing license act which will increase Game and Fish Division revenues making it possible for the Conservation Department to build at least five additional lakes per year. When these lakes are opened to the public they will be operated by the State Parks Division.

Major repairs to facilities and erection of several new buildings on some of the reservations were accomplished with timber sale and sand and gravel funds. Tremendous improvements were made at Gulf State Park (approximately \$150,000) using funds from sale of dead oyster shells removed from the bottom of Mobile Bay. Alabama's Conserva-

tion Director, according to a ruling by the Attorney General, has authority to spend such funds for capital improvements on lands under jurisdiction of the Conservation Department located in the Mobile Bay area. These expenditures were over and above the approved state park budget for the past year.

Plans are to begin development of two major state parks during the next fiscal year. One of these is located on the Guntersville Reservoir, a 4,000-acre tract of land given to Alabama by the Tennessee Valley Authority for State Park use. The other is located in Tuscaloosa County in central northwest Alabama and comprises approximately 2,000 acres given to the State by people of that locality for recreational use. Plans for 1956 also include development of two recreational areas for Negroes, one in central and one in south Alabama.

California. Earl P. Hanson, California Division of Beaches and Parks, Department of Natural Resources, reported:

The California State Park System continues to expand under the able guidance of the State Park Commission and the effective administration of Chief Newton B. Drury. At the 1955 General Session of the California Legislature many top priority projects of the Five-Year Program, approved by the Commission and the Director of Natural Resources, were the subject of appropriation bills amounting to approximately \$17,000,000 or one-third of the total suggested Five-Year Program. In addition to this, the 1955-56 Budget of the Division of Beaches and Parks appropriated \$5,900,000 from the oil royalties for support and operation of the State Park System. This included approximately \$2,000,000 for development and \$800,000 for land additions to existing areas.

Special appropriation bills included the following:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| (1) Redwood Highway By-pass..... | \$1,000,000 |
| (2) Establishment of Roadside Rest Program..... | 1,000,000 |
| (3) Shoreline Acquisition and Development | 9,000,000 |
| (4) Reservoir Recreational Projects—Acquisition
and Development..... | 1,000,000 |
| (5) Establishment of Interior Park Projects | 2,500,000 |
| (6) Establishment and Development of Historical
Monuments and Museums..... | 1,800,000 |

These appropriation bills carefully excluded the long term matching requirement, which has been typical of the State Park Commission's acquisition program.

Governor Goodwin J. Knight pocket vetoed all of the above, reasoning that since the major appropriation bill was drafted so that he could not delete specific projects from the bill, high priority projects would be seriously affected should he reduce the total appropriation. He does not believe the Legislature has given adequate consideration to the elimination of the long established matching provision. The Governor

believes that the development of an outstanding system of state beaches and parks in California is of utmost importance to the welfare and economy of the State, but must be in accordance with a sound, prudent and comprehensive master plan. He proposes to submit to the 1956 Budget Session of the Legislature, a Budget that will contain specific recommendations for a substantial beginning on such a beach and park acquisition and development program.

Chief Drury has said: "It is reassuring to know that the future of the California State Park System will be charted on this sound basis."

As an aid to the development of such a long-range program, the Division of Beaches and Parks has been granted a deficiency appropriation of \$50,000 for the purpose of gathering basic data and compiling a master plan report for the entire State Park System. Based upon the Commission's Five-Year Program, the report will take into consideration that the first year of this program is being accomplished through the Division's 1955-56 fiscal year budget.

The State Park Commission has scheduled two public hearings where agencies and organizations may present written statements regarding proposed State park projects. As a result of these presentations, the staff of the Division of Beaches and Parks may review the proposals and give consideration to them in any priority system that may be established for purposes of the Division's 1956-57 fiscal year budget. Thus, approximately \$64,000,000 in oil royalties available for appropriation under existing law will be programmed for expenditure over the remaining four years of the Commission's Five-Year Program. This program may well include a determination of such policies as the elimination of the matching principle, the initial establishment of a roadside rest program, the development of reservoir and other aquatic recreation projects and the establishment of criteria to determine State-wide projects as against regional or local projects.

Legislation which would have changed the present law allocating 70 percent of the oil drilling royalties to the State Park and State Beach Funds failed. With the formula intact, the Commission welcomes a new opportunity to plan for the use of the \$64,000,000 in royalties now and to be accumulated in those funds.

In bringing you Chief Drury's greetings, I also would like to bring you some of his inspirational comments:

What is California's future? Renowned for scenic beauty, rich traditions, abundant resources and great opportunities, this State, with 300,000 new population each year, is undergoing something akin to a revolution. Planners are speculating as to our problems twenty years from now when our present 12,500,000 will have increased to almost 20,000,000. Thought is being given to highways, to water, to housing, to many other material things. But I wonder whether sufficient thought is being given to the one thing that is most characteristic of California's distinction, and is summed up in this question:

"What kind of an environment will be preserved for these millions of people to live in when we reach the year 1975?"

We are planning super-highways for the future. Where will these highways lead our people, accustomed as they are to the beauty of our native landscape and to the healing effect for body and soul of contact with Nature out-of-doors? Those who travel from the smog of southern cities to the open spaces and clear air of the Borrego and Anza Deserts, or leave the heat of interior valleys to enjoy the cool shadows of the Redwood Highway, or the shimmering beauty of Emerald Bay on Lake Tahoe (to give but two of many examples), are seeking an *environment* that ministers to their needs. We can take pride that our pattern of land management and philosophy is responsible for preserving some of the wild places where our harassed population can seek relief from the tensions of mechanized urban life. It is going to take imagination and daring and great restraint for us to hold even the six-tenths of one percent of the surface of this great State which we have set aside in our state parks. What will the State Park System be in 1975? This gives us something to think about as we carry on our day-to-day assignments in the Division.

Connecticut. Donald C. Mathews, Director, Connecticut State Park and Forest Commission, reported:

Connecticut is a small densely populated State. A large percentage of the population is employed in the great industries of the State. These people and their families require nearby places for relaxation, and to provide for this Connecticut has seventy state parks. All are not developed but during the past year approximately four million visitors used the facilities.

New parks that were opened during the 1955 season were Kettletown State Park, Gay City State Park, and Taylor Brook Campground.

Practically no funds are available for capital improvements during the coming year. This is unfortunate as developed areas are now taxed beyond their capacity, and Connecticut must soon provide more adequate facilities in the state parks, or it will be impossible to meet the demand.

Connecticut has the good fortune to be the recipient of many desirable park areas, paid for from the earnings of the George Dudley Seymour Trust. The most recent acquisition purchased from this trust fund is Millers Pond State Park in the town of Durham, consisting of a fifty-acre lake and surrounding land, which, when developed, will add much to the recreational needs of central Connecticut.

A program of beach erosion control was completed at Hammonasset Beach State Park during the last year. A similar project is contemplated for Sherwood Island State Park in 1956.

Prior to July 1, 1955, Connecticut parks were operated from income plus a general fund appropriation. Now the operation is entirely out of the general fund. However, the potential income from the parks has been reflected in the general fund appropriation.

Unique is the operation of one park for the exclusive use of handicapped persons. Hundreds of people who normally would be conspicuous at a public state park enjoy the facilities of this area.

Florida. Elmer L. Hill, Director, Board of Florida Parks and Historic Memorials reported:

The Florida Park Service is glad to report continued and greater progress for the last fiscal year. All activities in maintenance, operation and construction have been *stepped up*. The biennial building program has been completed and 36 new park structures, ranging from picnic pavilion to a \$60,000 recreation building, are in use, or being equipped for use. Three undeveloped areas have been improved and are now in operation. One new area, Kingsley Plantation, a Historic Memorial, was purchased and added to the system.

Park usage increased, due to three factors: Increased interest, new facilities in existing areas and the opening of undeveloped areas. Attendance increased from 1,459,000 in 1953-54 to 2,100,000 in 1954-55. Receipts increased from \$136,300 to \$160,800. We anticipate proportionate increases this fiscal year. The demands for camping facilities are increasing steadily. One new group camp, accommodating 100 persons, has been added to the system. Day camp use by schools, recreation departments, and other organizations, have increased.

Operational expenditures for this fiscal year amounted to \$803,118. Of that amount, \$255,700 was spent for Operating Capital Outlay, which included the purchase of trucks, tractors, all types of equipment, and improvements to existing structures. These expenditures, with the \$465,000 Biennial Building and Improvement Fund, are very apparent to the Park patron. Roads in two Park areas have been paved.

Our Historic Memorials, long neglected, are now coming into prominence. We have built two museums and two more are scheduled for construction. Arrangements have been made with the Florida State Museum, a division of the University of Florida, to construct and furnish all interpretative exhibits. Modern techniques have been used and the results are very satisfactory. All historical data or information released is authenticated by the History Department of the University of Florida.

The relationship between the Florida Park Service and the 1955 Legislature was cordial. The progress that had been made was recognized and the result was an increase in appropriation.

Funds available for the next biennium are, as follows:

General Revenue.....	\$1,082,771
Trust Funds or receipts.....	401,000
Building and Improvements.....	526,000
	<hr/>
	\$2,009,771
Race Track Funds Volusia County.....	26,500
	<hr/>
	\$2,036,271

The Legislators from Volusia County introduced and had passed a law wherein County race track revenues would be used to match state appropriation for improvements in Tomoka State Park.

We have a working organization that is dedicated to the job of courteous service to the public. Every effort is being made to raise the standards of improvement, maintenance, service and safety. Public acceptance has been good. We are pleased, but not complacent with our progress.

Georgia. William M. Hay, of Decatur, Georgia, reported:

Georgia has a new Park Director, Mr. Roy Chalker. Mr. Chalker has discussed very frankly the big problem presented by the Park Program. He is aware of the need of sound policies in park practices, personnel planning, operation and administration. It is his desire and hope to secure help and advise in making needed changes to set up a sound program. I am very much impressed with his conscientious desire to do something worthwhile. The opportunity for Georgia Park Program to move forward I believe is the best it has been in the past twenty years. I am sure Mr. Chalker will welcome the support and help of the National Conference on State Parks.

Indiana. K. R. Cougill, Director, Division of State Parks, Lands and Waters, Indiana Department of Conservation, reported:

Although a great emphasis has been placed recently upon reducing the costs for operation and maintenance of the Indiana State Parks, our program of progress and development was not hampered. During the immediate past fiscal year, the Department encumbered funds exceeding \$1,694,000 for park purposes.

Of this amount, over \$825,000 were encumbered for a good construction program of capital improvements which included \$550,000 for a dam at Versailles, \$145,000 for a group camp at Lincoln, \$30,000 for four (4) family cabins at Shakamak, \$40,000 for a wildlife exhibit and modern comfort station at Brown County State Park and \$63,000 for road paving and miscellaneous construction.

The revenue-producing operations earned an income of slightly over \$983,000. Upon a recommendation by our Division, the members of the Conservation Commission adopted a policy protecting state parks from exploration by uranium hunters. This policy is considered to be one of the many decisions which continue to protect the state parks from encroachments.

During the previous year there were 2,410,383 visitors to our state properties—making another year in which the total admissions exceeded 2,000,000 people.

The State Park Inns continued to operate with emphasis on serving the family group. Children, under 14 years of age, when accompanied

by both parents, are provided free lodging, paying for meals only. An inspection of the recent publication entitled *State Park Statistics, 1954*, produced by the National Park Service, revealed that 42 percent of all guest nights spent in all state park inns and lodges in the Nation are spent in Indiana State Park Inns and Lodges.

Indiana entered the current fiscal year with approximately \$2,000,000 available for improvements and operations. This amount is equally divided between improvements and operations.

The dam now under construction at Versailles will provide an impounded water area covering about 270 acres. In addition, the new lake will provide a water supply for the Town of Versailles and the town will in turn provide treated water for use at Versailles State Park. Arrangements are also being made to provide drinking water to nearby communities, in the vicinity of Versailles, which have suffered from an acute water shortage during serious droughts of the past few years.

Construction of a modern group camp, to accommodate 120 campers and 30 leaders, is well underway. This new group camp, being the first one at Lincoln State Park, will serve the youth groups in southwestern Indiana. The popularity of family cabins at several of the parks prompted the construction of four new cabins at Shakamak at a cost of approximately \$30,000.

In a number of the parks, rest room facilities have been expanded by providing pit toilets with louvered sides and pits arranged so as to provide easy access for removal of waste.

By action of the 1955 Legislature, Old Goshen Church State Memorial was returned to the original owners. Buildings at New Harmony were turned over to this Division as a State Memorial. Plans have been made to rehabilitate the Fauntleroy House for public visitation. As time and funds permit, additional buildings of the New Harmony Memorial will be restored and made accessible to the public.

New pens have already been constructed for the large mammals at the Brown County Wildlife Exhibit. A modern rest room, near the wildlife area, is nearly completed. The exhibit includes a reptile pit and small pens for the smaller mammals and birds now being housed in the old Wildlife Exhibit building.

Now that certain major developments have been initiated at Versailles and Lincoln State Parks, according to our master plan of development, it is planned to proceed with complete development of these two areas. With the advent of a new bathhouse at Lincoln, more modern facilities will be offered to summer visitors. Needed expansion and development in other state parks will be continued as funds are made available.

The Tenth Annual Great Lakes Park Training Institute will be held at Pokagon State Park during the last week of February, 1956. Since its inception in 1946, this Institute has grown to the point where it is

considered as the most valuable source of education training and inspiration to people in park work. By means of our park superintendents' meetings and close contacts with operations in the field, our in-service training program will continue.

The Chain O' Lakes State Park Project, in northeastern Indiana, will continue to receive the attention of all those interested in promoting this area as an addition to the State Park System of Indiana.

Iowa. Wilbur A. Rush, Chief, Division of Lands and Waters, reported:

Unusually fine weather, coupled with an absence of serious storms or floods, made this past season one of the most favorable in past years. By mid-season $\frac{1}{2}$ million more visitors had used Iowa's parks, as compared to the previous season. Total attendance this year will exceed 5,000,000 visitors for the first time in the history of our park system.

A sharp increase in the use of water areas has been noted. Because of the many points of access to our lakes it is impossible accurately to check on the increased use, but a good measuring device is the registration of boats with our office. A year ago an increase of 100 percent over all previous years was noted. This year registrations have increased 100 percent over last year. Boat dealers report sharp increases in the sale of boats, motors, and water skis, and all of our bathhouse operators report increases in the use of our state park beaches.

Overnight cabin use has remained static, principally because no new units have been added. Most of our cabins are well reserved and people who are unable to secure cabin reservations are turning to tent camping for their accommodations. In all areas offering tent camping we have experienced at least a 50 percent increase in the number of campers and in many areas the increase is 100 percent or better. As a result more effort is being expended to improve tent and trailer camping facilities.

Development of Iowa's two newest artificial lakes has remained at a standstill during the past year. Work on Prairie Rose Lake in Shelby County has been held up by litigation in court.

The new lake in Montgomery County has been held up because of lack of funds, but will now proceed under our new Capital Improvement appropriation.

This was a legislative year in Iowa and several laws affecting the department were passed. One important measure was a law permitting Counties to establish County Conservation Boards empowered to acquire, develop, and maintain county parks. Such a county park system in Iowa will be a valuable supplement to our state park system.

A law legalizing the use of prison labor in state parks and another legalizing the use of county road equipment were also passed. These laws should give us a little relief in our maintenance problems and also aid in our development program.

A new appropriation of \$1,173,000 was voted for Capital Improvements in state parks. \$550,000 annually was appropriated for maintenance and operation of the Division of Lands and Waters, which is an increase of 75,500 over the previous biennium. However, \$75,000 was earmarked for utilization of prison labor, so in reality we will be operating on the same budget as in previous years. About 75 percent of the appropriation has been budgeted for state parks.

During the past year a new park film in color showing the development of an artificial lake has been released. A year ago I reported to you on the initiation of our series of television programs. These are being continued and I am proud to report this year that this series of programs has been chosen for showing to our armed forces at home and abroad.

With the initiation of a prison labor program and a larger Capital Improvement Budget, the coming year promises to be a busy and active year.

Kentucky. Henry Ward, Commissioner, Department of Conservation, reported:

A program of expansion of Kentucky State Parks was continued during the past year, with the objective of developing a major state park to serve each geographic area of the State.

Three new state park areas were accepted for the park system: Greenbo Lake with 3,000 acres in Greenup County; 1,000 acres for a recreational park in Pendleton County; and 25 acres for a historical shrine in Boone County.

A contract was let for a \$600,000 lodge in General Butler State Park, Carrollton, Ky. Other major construction included: boat dock and marina at Dewey Lake State Park; central restaurant, gift shop and headquarters building at Carter Caves State Park; new dining room, lake and bathhouse and beach at Pine Mountain State Park; restoration and furnishing of General Butler home at General Butler State Park; addition of 9 holes to golf course at Kentucky Dam Village State Park; building of horse riding stables at Natural Bridge, Kentucky Lake, Pennyriple, General Butler and Kentucky Dam Village parks.

Major emphasis was placed on landscaping in many of the new parks of the Kentucky system, and on replacement of furnishings. The national trend toward air-conditioning was recognized, and systems were provided for all state park dining rooms and lounges. DuPont Lodge at Cumberland Falls was completely air-conditioned.

State park receipts from operations climbed to approximately \$2,100,000 during the fiscal year of 1954-55. Capital outlay expenditures in addition to that sum totalled approximately \$1,500,000.

It was estimated that 4,500,000 persons used Kentucky parks during the past year.

Kentucky cooperated with Virginia in the establishment of the Breaks Interstate Park, in the Cumberland mountains on the border of the two States. A separate Breaks Interstate Park Commission was created to develop and operate this park.

The State explored the possibility of issuing revenue bonds to finance the construction of new facilities, but no definite steps in that direction were taken.

Otter Creek Park, Clinton G. Johnson, reported:

The year 1955 has been an outstanding year for Otter Creek Park.

I believe that Louisville is one of very few cities with a rural park such as Otter Creek Park. We have approximately 2600 wooded acres located on a big bend of the Ohio River forty miles from the city. The park was started during the 1930's as a recreational demonstration project. We have three organization camps, one housing 180 and the two others 80 each. These are booked solid from April 15th to November 1st, and would be used during the winter if the construction of the buildings made it possible to keep them warm.

Our day camp area is used by the Parks and Recreation of Louisville who bring 40 children each day by bus during the summer.

Our picnic areas located on the river where once stood the town of Rock Haven are the most popular in the park. Our tent camp area has been used this year by people from as far away as California and Maine.

We have started the system of charging for large picnic groups (10c per person) and for campers (25c per person per night) this year and there has been no objection to the fee.

Our biggest policy change has been to remove race restrictions for all park users and we have had no trouble from this step. So far we have found that in general the negro campers and picnickers leave a cleaner area than most groups.

Our use has increased far beyond our facilities and we requested \$19,000 additional capital improvement funds, mainly for use in the picnic areas. I understand that this request was granted just before I left for this conference. This money is in addition to our 1955-56 budget of \$45,000.

A new approach road from U.S. Highway 31W and 60 is supposed to be started this fall.

Our 1955 use will exceed 125,000 and about 42 percent of this is campers.

Louisiana. William W. Wells, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission, sent the following report:

Successful progress on the current Capital Improvement Program, most of which was done with force account labor, is one of the most important things accomplished during the past year. This includes the

construction of two small group camp swimming pools with a simplified recirculation system which has worked out very effectively. The cost of these pools, 25 x 60 feet, averaged a modest \$22,000 each.

Construction on Sam Houston State Park near Lake Charles was initiated after the Department of Highways let a contract to construct a bridge, which will give access to the area. This project has been hanging fire for several years.

Additions were made to the technical and clerical staff of the Central Office in order to keep pace with the expanded operational and construction program. A greatly expanded publicity program was put into effect which has paid dividends in a number of different ways.

A great improvement was made in operating procedures, service and accounting in the facilities which produce income. From this Revolving Fund operation, a considerable amount of repair work and equipment replacement was paid for and the fund still ended up with a ten percent net profit.

A total of \$295,000 was available for Capital Improvements during the past year. The planned program for development next year is based on a total of \$470,000 for Capital Improvements. Two new areas, the Edward Douglass White Memorial Park, and the Mansfield Battle Park will be placed in operation. Repair and refurnishing of the birthplace of the former Chief Justice White of the U. S. Supreme Court is approximately 75 percent completed. A Confederate Memorial Museum is on the drawing board for the Mansfield Battle Park.

An area immediately adjacent to Lake Bistineau State Park has been acquired on a 99-year lease arrangement for the purpose of providing negro park and recreational facilities for the northern portion of the State. A similar development will also be made of the eastern shore of Chicot Lake to provide facilities for the south-central portion of the State.

Although the actual deeds have not been signed, a new park of approximately 1800 acres has been acquired for the purpose of providing a large regional park to serve the Baton Rouge area. It is the former Idlewild Plantation which was owned by the State Department of Institutions and was made available to the State Parks and Recreation Commission without cost.

Increased usage at all of the State Park Areas was noted, especially at Lake Bistineau State Park, and also in the museums on three of the other areas.

Maine. Harold J. Dyer, Director of State Parks, reported:

The Honorable Percival P. Baxter is still adding lands to Baxter State Park in the Katahdin Region. Recent gifts accepted by the legislature involve an additional township increasing the area to 193,254 acres. An area of 28,594 acres has been set aside with the provision

that scientific forest management be practiced. This tract and an adjacent 14,005 acres also have been set aside as lands open to hunting and trapping.

The original park area involving six additional townships is still "to be maintained primarily as a wilderness, and recreational purposes are to be regarded as of secondary importance and shall not encroach upon the main objective of this area which is to be 'Forever Wild.' " There are six major tent campgrounds at this park, two of which can be approached only by trail. "The sole purpose of the donor in creating this Park is to protect the forests and wildlife therein as a great wilderness area unspoiled by man."

Expansion and improvement of facilities has been in progress on all areas, but demands far outpace the supply. Work is nearing completion on the 1½ mile coastal beach area, Reid State Park, with the construction of additional roads, parking, bathhouse, concession, water and sewerage facilities. Two parks, Lake St. George and Aroostook, have been redesigned and enlarged. Tent camping facilities are being expanded on all areas, and to meet the demand a two week camping limit has been applied in an attempt to serve as many visitors as possible. A \$100,000 capital appropriation is available for further improvement work in the next two years.

Maryland. Joseph F. Kaylor, Director, Department of Forests and Parks, reported:

The total appropriation for operation and maintenance was \$162,498. Budgeted receipts of \$53,928 added to this show a total of \$216,426 for the fiscal year. The total appropriation for capital improvement was \$176,000. This amount was spread between several parks where additions and improvements were most needed.

The areas administered include 12 parks which have been developed at a total cost of \$2,628,222, and two undeveloped parks that have cost \$36,932. The total cost is \$2,665,154. There are no memorials or other type of areas included.

Attendance estimated for the year was 1,572,155.

Receipts budgeted for expenditures amounted to \$47,115, and funds received and sent to the general revenue fund came to \$18,278, together, making a total of \$65,393. For the sake of comparison, total expenditures for the previous fiscal year were: Operation and maintenance \$206,480 and capital outlay \$376,515 or a total of \$582,995. This Report includes appropriations for state parks only and does not include outlays for general administrative expenses.

Recreation facilities to be found in our parks include picnic areas, play fields, swimming beaches, fishing, boating piers and rental boats, campsites, hiking and nature trails, rental cabins and bridle trails. Rates, fees and charges are, for car parking 50 cents, reserved picnic

table and fireplace one dollar per day, reserved small shelter two dollars per day, reserved large pavilion \$7.50 per day, camp site one dollar per day, bath house 50 cents.

A package deal at a heavily used area has proved popular where we charge one dollar for car parking, picnic table, fireplace and a bag of charcoal.

Of major importance among events of the past year was the transfer by the Federal Government of 4,500 acres of land of the Catoctin Recreation Development Area to the State. This land was named Cunningham Falls State Park and Recreation Area. It is a valuable and potentially great addition to our State Park System. Also of importance was the opening of a new unit in Patapsco State Park, designated the Hollofield Recreation Area, on U. S. Route 40, six miles west of Baltimore. This unit also provides a roadside rest and information area for the comfort and convenience of travelers. At Sandy Point State Park, adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, parking facilities were extensively enlarged to accommodate increased attendance. At Elk Neck State Park the camping area was enlarged in response to the heavy increase in demand for tent campsites. Gambrill State Park, one of the oldest in the system, benefited in the construction program with the addition of improved sanitary and water facilities, plus a loop road which opens up more picnic and play areas.

Acquisition: Patapsco, Harper's Ferry, for the National Park, and Dry Creek Lake.

Planned program for 1955-56 includes development of Deep Creek Lake State Park, a new recreation area at Patapsco State Park, acquisition of land for Pen-Mar State Park and Wye Mill State Park and development of a new beach at Elk Neck State Park.

Capital improvement funds for 1955-56 amount to \$351,000.

Massachusetts. Raymond J. Kenney, State Forest and Park Director, reported:

Substantial progress in Park development is under way in Massachusetts.

He pointed out that beginning with 1954 the sum of approximately \$4,000,000 has been appropriated to that Division for park development and the projects are now under way.

This will involve the construction and opening up of five new Parks in addition to the thirty-five Parks and recreation areas on State Forests which have heretofore been operated.

In addition to the foregoing, the Division of Public Beaches in the Department of Public Works has approximately \$4,500,000 for the development of the present Salisbury Beach Reservation and for the purchase and development of two additional ocean beaches.

In the Division of Forests and Parks, the revenue has increased to the point where approximately \$140,000 was collected during the past year and this amount would have been larger had not hurricanes closed some of the areas in mid-season both in 1954 and 1955.

Director Kenney also reported that his Division is cooperating with the State Department of Public Works in the establishment of some 1,000 roadside rest areas which are extensively used by the motoring public. Tables for these roadside areas are constructed at the Prison Camp on the Myles Standish State Forest.

The Prison Camp at the Myles Standish State Forest has been of material benefit in developing the park and recreation program in the State and in the recent session of the legislature the establishment of four additional Prison Camps on State Forests has been authorized. When these are constructed and in operation, it will further augment the efforts of the Division to develop recreational facilities for the people of Massachusetts and the increasing number of tourists, to say nothing of the rehabilitation benefits to the men assigned to these camps.

Director Kenney concluded by pointing out very definitely that Massachusetts was definitely on the move in the field of park and recreation development and that a very bright future was on the horizon.

Michigan. Arthur C. Elmer, Chief, Parks and Recreation Division, Michigan Department of Conservation, reported:

Weather conditions in Michigan were responsible for another major upswing in state park use. By the end of the year we will have issued more than 95,000 permits to camp; attendance has also increased proportionately. Park lands, roads and parking areas are literally worn out.

Funds for consolidating ownership in existing parks, extending present park boundaries and purchasing new areas to satisfy the demand for outdoor recreation is a *must*. In spite of the fact that we now have 175,000 acres of state park lands, we cannot keep up with the demand for outdoor recreation.

Specific legislation permitting charges for admission or parking or greatly increased appropriations is necessary to continue to provide lands, facilities and services for park users. Our attempts to get legislation for charging for admission or parking failed. Our "sticker" bill failed. The earmarking of funds from the sale of gas, oil and minerals from state-owned land, estimated at \$1,250,000, for use for park capital improvements did not get out of committee.

We need some of the National Park Service publicity, national coverage in magazines of wide circulation of the type recently presented by Connie Wirth in the *Saturday Evening Post*. This article was excellent and should produce results for the National Park Service. We in the States need the same kind of publicity; not that we need more people but we need more money for land and facilities to take care of those

we now have and those we expect to have in the future.

We cannot keep up with our own population increases or visitors in providing outdoor recreation—lands and facilities—and we will have to “get on the bandwagon” with education, mental health and highways to get the recognition which we in state parks rightfully deserve.

During the past year we completed two units of the Proud Lake group camp which will ultimately provide year-long recreational opportunities for 120 youngsters. We requested \$1,000,000 to cover the acquisition of lands for 1955-56—we received only \$80,000. We are required by the Legislature to submit a five-year capital improvement budget which is revised each year to keep it up to date. This provides a “sounding board” for funds needed to carry out capital improvement programs for all state agencies throughout the State.

Unless material increases are received for personal service, parks or parts of parks will have to be closed after the attendance reaches the designed capacity of the parking, picnicking and/or camping areas.

Sanitation, a public health matter in state parks, will receive major consideration in planning and construction for 1956-57.

Minnesota. U. W. Hella, Director, division of State Parks, Department of Conservation, reported:

The past year has been highlighted by acts of Minnesota's biennial legislature, as they affect the state park system and its operations. Of prime concern was the matter of budget. We are happy to report that funds were authorized to a total of \$1,024,000. This exceeds the past biennium's appropriation by roughly, \$154,000. The 1953 appropriations totaled \$870,000 including a \$450,000 loan from the Division of Game and Fish.

The new biennium's appropriation of \$1,024,000 is made up as follows:

From General Revenue.....	\$ 428,000.00
From Reappropriated receipts.....	17,000.00
From Revenue Bonds (Payable over 10 yrs. beginning 1958).....	525,000.00
Sticker Revenues 1955-57 (Balance after full payment of \$450,000 Game and Fish Loan of past biennium).....	54,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,024,000.00

It is to be noted that \$579,000 of this authorized appropriation is dependent on sticker revenue. Sticker revenue originates from a requirement that any automobile entering a Minnesota state park must have affixed to its windshield a sticker which costs \$1 and is good throughout the state park system for the calendar year in which issued. This law was enacted by the 1953 legislature. The first year of its opera-

tion, it produced \$73,000. Last year gross revenue realized amounted to \$103,000. Based on revenues to date, we anticipate that sales for the 1955 calendar year will amount to approximately \$130,000.

The original sticker act was amended in the past legislative session as follows:

1. Areas of 50 acres or less were exempted from the sticker requirement. This amendment resulted in very little loss of revenue inasmuch as it was impractical to administer the law in these smaller areas.

2. Amendment makes sticker effective from preceding October 1st of the calendar year for which issued. This eliminates the objection of late season park users to the purchase of a sticker effective for a limited period. This amendment does not affect gross sales for the reason that the park user still purchases one sticker each year.

3. Provides for a two day (specific dates) use sticker that can be purchased by organizations in minimum lots of 25 at twenty-five cents each. This concession helps out sponsors of large organized picnics and actually increases gross revenue.

These amendments were department sponsored. A number of bills were introduced which would reduce the effectiveness of the sticker law, none of these bills progressed beyond the committees to which they were referred.

In addition to the appropriation from general revenue for the purpose of operation, maintenance and improvement \$22,950 was appropriated for the purpose of buying strategic land parcels adjacent or inside boundaries of seven different state parks.

The new biennium's budget permitted an expansion of the Naturalist program to four areas. This program is sponsored and financed jointly with the University of Minnesota's Museum of Natural History. Sticker sales in areas in which Naturalist services are provided greatly exceeded the normal increase experienced throughout the system—indicating the acceptance of this program by the public.

System attendance—on the basis of incomplete returns—should exceed $2\frac{1}{4}$ million.

Tourist camping has again increased phenomenally. We expect that final figures for this season will show a 25 percent increase over two years ago.

Of the \$1,024,000 appropriation \$388,000 is scheduled for improvements—provided that anticipated revenues are realized and provided that we are not confronted with unusual emergencies.

The improvement program is directed primarily at replacement of obsolete and worn out facilities and toward providing the badly needed basic facilities such as toilets, water and sewer systems.

We, in Minnesota, feel that we are making progress.

Missouri. Austin Houston, reported:

Use of Missouri's parks has steadily increased in the year 1955. Endowed with great natural beauty they draw increasing numbers of visitors each year, many of whom are repeat visitors. The scenic wonders combined with adequate facilities for visitor comfort and convenience draw the many visitors for vacations, holidays and week-end visits. Total attendance in our parks in 1954 was a record 2,368,400.

Providing facilities and protection of the natural beauty of our parks is the task entrusted to a six-member bipartisan State Park Board. Missouri parks have been under this administration for the past two years. Funds for operation of the system are provided by appropriation from the General Revenues of the State. The law creating the present administration also provided that State Park revenues be earmarked as a State Park Fund. An appropriation of \$1,150,000 from General Revenue and \$190,000 of Park earnings have been provided by the Legislature for operation of the system during the present biennium, which ends June 30, 1957.

Several new facilities have been started during the past year. New deep wells to provide adequate water supplies, a store and restaurant building, dining lodge and recreation building for organized group camp, a new beach area, service building and boat house, and also water and sewer system in one of the newer park areas. Plans are underway for additional buildings and enlargement of present facilities in the near future.

Two areas of over 4000 acres have recently been made available by gift to the system for use as state parks. With the addition of these two areas the total acreage of Missouri State Parks now stands at 66,302 acres and the number of state parks increased from twenty-five to twenty-seven.

Montana. Ashley C. Roberts, State Park Director, State Highway Commission, reported:

Montana has had a successful year so far as State Park operations are concerned. Attendance at our Lewis and Clark Caverns State Park reached an all time high and attendance at other parks was up from a year ago. The demand for camping facilities is increasing every year. This increase in attendance and the demand for camping facilities appear to fall in line with the national trend in this direction.

There has been no change in the Montana State Park administrative set up. We operate as the Park Division of the State Highway Department and are responsible directly to the Highway Commission.

Our budget for the current bi-ennium is \$42,000 per year . . . up \$7,000 each year from the last bi-ennium. Of this amount \$21,000 was appropriated from the General Fund of the state and the other \$21,000 is earned from our operations at Lewis and Clark Caverns, our only

revenue producing operation. Of the total amount \$3,000 was earmarked for capital improvements.

At the National Conference last year we reported ten parks in operation. Since that time we have placed four more parks in use and now have fourteen parks that are active. This does not mean that these parks are complete and all facilities placed. We have a tremendous amount of work to do in each area but we are making these areas available while development continues. With a small budget our development program will proceed at a very slow rate.

Montana has a long way to go in the state park field. In general, we have much to offer to travelers and to our own folks who are seeking their recreation out of doors but we are just discovering that recreational areas must be preserved and must be properly maintained. The casual picnic just anywhere on a back road by a mountain stream is getting to be a thing of the past.

In the year ahead we may add one or two more parks. Our big task, though, will be the further development and enlargement of those areas already in operation.

New Hampshire. Russell B. Tobey, Director, Recreation Division, N. H. Forestry and Recreation Department, reported:

While the trend of park patronage has been steadily upward for several years, the rate of increase dropped during the current year. This may be attributed to poor summer weather conditions. The trend in tent camping, however, showed a strong increase of over 20 percent from the previous year; and skiing, because of excellent winter weather, exceeded anything heretofore, with patronage for last winter at Cannon Mountain estimated at over 90,000.

Capital improvements providing some needed facilities to keep pace with growing use were carried out to the extent of \$64,000. The capacity of all facilities was hard pressed when weather conditions, winter or summer, were favorable.

Since it is presently state policy that capital investments in the park systems will be a charge on their future income, the dilemma of future debt versus present need is growing acute.

A greater amount of information about parks and their facilities, through a greater variety of folders, booklets, posters, and some advertising of ski facilities, has been brought about through a new administrative section known as Advertising, Publicity and Information. Heading this is an experienced newspaperman who has achieved wide acceptance of stories and pictures on parks and their use in the local and metropolitan press.

We have a growing concern that our attention to park matters is being diverted by the many administrative chores required of us by other state agencies. Such matters as the reclassification of personnel,

realignment of duties, changes in payroll procedures, and adjustments in legal interpretations have, in the past year, consumed a great deal of our time. As a by-product, however, we have achieved a Manual of Procedure which may be expected to increase our efficiency. While fulfilling the many chores required of us, we are convinced that a greater amount of our time and attention is required for the protection of park scenery and the refinement of park services.

New Jersey. Fred D. Eckhart reported, for Joseph E. McLean, Commissioner, Department of Conservation and Economic Development.

1955 was the 50th anniversary of the Forests and Parks Section, Department of Conservation and Economic Development, of the State of New Jersey.

In 1905 the first law was passed for the establishing of a Forest Reserve Commission and a Forest Reserve.

It is gratifying to be able to report on this anniversary the first major progress since termination of recreational area developments under the C.C.C. program in 1941-1942.

Under direction of Commissioner Joseph E. McLean, a five-stage program for development of Recreational Facilities in Forest and Park areas was prepared and submitted to Governor Robert B. Meyner.

This program included provision for the establishment of camps for housing institutional labor to be utilized for semi- and unskilled jobs.

The year is also marked by gains in area with acquisition of the Worthington Estate, the eastern shoulder of the Delaware Water Gap, containing about 6,200 acres and completion of the acquisition of the Wharton Tract of about 95,000 acres.

Funds for the fiscal year 1955-56 currently available for the first stage of the capital improvement program total about \$1,000,000 of which \$550,000 is available for much needed public recreational facilities such as water supply, sanitary facilities, added picnicking and bathing facilities, etc. \$100,000 for work camps, and about \$350,000 for access-ways, roads and parkings.

Budget requests recently completed will be submitted for the second stage of the capital improvement program.

New Mexico. Carl A. Freeman, Los Alamos, reported:

The state of New Mexico saw an increase in state park activity this year. Approximately 800,000 people visited the parks this season.

The budget for fiscal year 1954 amounted to \$31,732.00, while 1955 amounted to \$114,080.00. Broken down in the following categories:

	1954	1955
Salaries.....	\$19,210.00	\$33,030.00
Operation Expense.....	\$20,042.00	\$15,050.00
Capital Improvement.....	\$ 2,500.00	\$66,000.00

These changes were in the main, due to Conchas Dam State Park being returned to the control of the State Park Commission from the Game and Fish Department.

Improvement this year on the existing state parks is planned to be about \$30,000.00.

New York. James F. Evans, Director of State Parks, Conservation Department, reported:

A record-breaking hot summer drove New York State park activity to new highs. Attendance increased about 10 percent and should reach 25,000,000. Revenues are up slightly more and will hit about \$3,000,000 for the year.

Few changes developed in administration. A start was made in three regions about setting up a Competitive Civil Service position of Assistant General Manager, to improve the career opportunities of the service and to provide a successor to the top regional executive.

New capital funds available were slightly less than in preceding years, but a considerable carry-over of active work from previous appropriations helped to carry on and complete a normal program of improvements. Parkway appropriations were \$15,000,000. Park construction funds including reconstruction and minor improvements, totaled \$1,683,000.

One new area was acquired for state park purposes on the St. Lawrence River—some 500 acres with about 6,000 feet of shore line. This will supplement the park area being developed for the Thousand Islands region by the State Power Authority at Massena of some 2,000 acres and when both are added to the present holdings in the Thousand Islands region, the State at last will have a sound and substantial park set-up in this district.

Under Authority auspices, the six lane improvement of the Southern State Parkway was completed to Wantagh Avenue, a distance of some 18 miles, at a cost of 40 million dollars. Work was begun on a second boat basin at Fire Island and a start made on the major reconstruction of Sunken Meadow State Park, including the last section of the connecting parkway spur.

In the Hudson Valley, the Anthony Wayne \$2,000,000 recreational area was formally opened in June and had a highly successful season. Good progress was made on both the Taconic and Palisades parkways. Restoration was begun of the skating at Bear Mountain, destroyed by fire several years ago, a \$300,000 job.

Plans were completed and development continued on newly acquired

Evangola park in the Niagara region.

High on next year's schedule are: full scale redevelopment of Sunken Meadow State Park on Long Island; start on the Sprain Parkway in Westchester County; completion of grading for the Palisades Parkway from the George Washington bridge to the park, a distance of approximately 40 miles (this will be completed in the fall of 1958); new park areas in the Allegany and Finger Lakes regions; development of Evangola Park to the point of full public use; and construction of the Thousand Islands program in co-operation with the Power Authority.

North Carolina. Thomas W. Morse, Superintendent of State Parks, Department of Conservation, reported:

Highlight events in the North Carolina State Park System during the past year have included boisterous visits from Hurricanes Hazel, Connie and Diane; dedication of new park facilities; a reorganization of responsibilities and an all time high in public use.

Hurricane Hazel caused severe damage to buildings and natural features at coastal areas and heavy damage to forests as far inland as Raleigh and Durham. Repair of damage to buildings and facilities at one state park, Fort Macon, exceeded \$30,000. The visits of Hurricanes Connie and Diane this summer caused only minor damage.

New facilities placed in operation included a restaurant and observation lounge at Mount Mitchell State Park; beach, swimming area, bathhouse and refreshment stand at Cliffs of the Neuse State Park; the re-constructed Overseer's House at Pettigrew State Park; reconstructed and enlarged parking areas at Mount Mitchell State Park; and a number of additions and improvements to existing facilities.

As an experiment, a self-service information center has been constructed at William B. Umstead State Park. This consists of a small building with an information map of the park, a nature and hiking trails map with exhibits, and a proposed development exhibit. Two outdoor exhibits cover group camping and protection.

The major project now under construction is a completely new road and parking area system at William B. Umstead State Park. Also, contracts totalling \$662,312 have been let for the restoration of Tryon Palace. This work is financed by donations made by the late Mrs. Maude Moore Latham of Greensboro.

The major land acquisition has been the acquisition of 20 tracts for the Tryon Palace Project at a cost of \$111,000—\$91,000 from the private donation and \$20,000 from state funds.

Between July 1, 1953 and June 30, 1955, \$275,051 was spent on capital improvements, exclusive of the Tryon Palace Project. These funds came from previous capital improvements appropriations since no additional capital improvement funds were made available by either the 1953 or 1955 sessions of the General Assembly.

Upon the recommendation of the Commission for the Study of the Reorganization of the State Government, the 1955 General Assembly passed an Act transferring responsibility for State Historic Sites from the Department of Conservation and Development to the Department of Archives and History effective July 1, 1955. So far, five historic sites have been so transferred. This has been the only change in administrative procedure.

Over the past two years, public use of the North Carolina State Parks has averaged more than 1,600,000. Gratifying as is the public support of the state park program that this attendance reflects, we are more concerned with what the public gets from its use of state parks than in merely increasing attendance figures. We have, therefore, devoted a great deal of time to making each person's use of a state park a satisfying experience and we have particularly emphasized enjoyment of natural features through hiking, camping, nature study and similar activities. Our planned program for next year will include greater emphasis on this, as well as stepped up maintenance programs, intensified personnel training (made necessary by a rather large turnover of personnel this year), further improvements in operation, and advance planning for further development of the state park system.

Ohio. V. W. Flickinger, Chief, Division of Parks, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, reported:

I. Accomplishments

Acquisition

505 acres by Gift—known locally as Big Creek, Geauga County by Cleveland citizens headed by S. Livingston Mather, G. G. Wade, Louise H. Ingalls, Mari Anne M. Hadden

738 acres by purchase—cost \$305,592—largest single purchase

530 acres New Area Portage Lakes, near Akron—appraised at over \$500,000

1,386 acres by transfer from Forestry Division of Department

1,097 acres under option—cost \$64,600

Buildings—completed or underway

Cabins, housekeeping utility 69; change booths 18; 6 under construction; concession buildings (temp) 4; latrines 30, 3 under construction; residences 4, 2 under construction; service buildings 3, 2 under construction

Contracts Awarded

Findley—94 acre lake—contract \$282,110.70

Hargeu Creek—150 acre Lake contract \$211,732.06

Hueston Woods—600 acre Lake contract \$640,494.87

Rocky Fork Hydraulic Gate \$80,100.00

Dedication

■ Crane Creek Beach—Lake Erie 1,000 ft. beach—first section
 ■ of proposed 3.5 mile of beach development

Dredging

*426,895 c.y. Clam Shell dredging—channel cleaning

686,369 c.y. Suction Dredging

1,113,264 c.y. Dredging

*49,719 L.F. or 9.5. mi. of channel 50 ft. wide cleaned

Utilities

Gas Line 9,400 L.F. Power (underground) 15,400 L.F.

Sewer 8,200 L.F.; Water 11,600 L.F.; Wells 9

Septic Tank cap. 22,635 gals. Water-storage facilities 70,500 gals.

Other

Campsites—permanent 275, 175 under construction; campsites temp. 130; fireplaces 308; parking 2,350 cars, 2,925 car under construction; picnic tables 1,613; ramps, boat unloading 3; roads 9,200 L.F., 34,000 L.F. under construction; signs and markers 545; trees reforestation 59,600.

II. Attendance

10,621,071—an increase of 969,188

61,544—cabins and lodges

124,025—tent and trailer—increase of 60,050

almost double over last year—in line with national trend

III. Fiscal

Appropriations

Capital Improvements—biennium (2 year).....\$3,118,900

Maintenance and operation F.Y. 1955-56..... 659,777

Plus receipts from operated facilities Est..... 482,000

Total available.....\$4,260,677

Expenditures—F.Y. 1954-55

Capital Improvements.....\$3,342,943

Maintenance and Operation..... 874,363

Total Expended.....\$4,217,306

Expenditures—F.Y. 1955-56—Estimated

Capital Improvements.....\$1,670,000

Maintenance, Operation and Development 1,206,000

\$2,876,000

IV.

Completions—lake contracts, 5 mi. of road, parking areas, residences, group camp building, lodge with 9 sleeping rooms, campsites.

Construction—3 additional lakes for recreation and water supply, 5 bathing beaches, water supply systems, etc.

Continuance of dredging program and cleaning of channels.

V. Legislation

Resolution—Legislative study of dock fee permit charges

Sale of reservoir lands—canal feeders.

40 hour week.

Ohio Historical Society. Richard S. Fatig, Superintendent, Division of Properties, Ohio Historical Society, reported:

Ohio always has an advantage in this section of the Conference as we are permitted two reports.

In reporting the activities of the Ohio Historical Society we follow previous reporters and say "We need more money."

Restoration was continued on previously reported projects but the capital improvement fund appropriated by the last General Assembly is certainly not sufficient for an enlarged program during the present biennium. We will, however, go as far as possible.

In Ohio we have a step system in the job classification with additional increases in salary range governed by the cost of living index. This is an excellent system and all employees deserve the salaries, and even more if possible. We find ourselves with an ever increasing appropriation but no provision for additional employees.

During the last General Assembly many position classifications were increased and a mandatory 40 hour week was instituted but appropriations to care for the increases and extra help were not made.

We had over two and a quarter million visitors in our fifty-seven historic properties during the past year and anticipate an increase next year, so I believe you will agree we have a problem.

In Ohio we are experiencing an increased interest in things historical. We feel that this will be of great assistance to us in future appropriations. One outstanding step forward was the enactment of legislation making the study of Ohio history mandatory in the Ohio schools.

Oklahoma. Ernest E. Allen, Director, Division of Recreation and State Parks, Oklahoma Planning and Resources Bd., sent this report:

Highlight of the past year was the approval and beginning of construction on the $7\frac{1}{4}$ million dollar self-liquidating Bond Program for public recreational facilities in the state parks of Oklahoma. Secondly, the attendance in state parks doubled in the past year—bringing our attendance figure for the 13 state parks, 6 recreational areas and 4 Monuments and Memorials to $5\frac{1}{4}$ million visitors.

The Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, under which the Division of State Parks operates, was re-organized, changing from a seven-member board to eleven-member board. The Governor re-

appointed four of the original board members, and appointed a new chairman of the board and six other new members.

We have available approximately \$100,000 for capital improvements.

One new state park area was acquired by order of the state legislature, with money for its improvement.

Accomplishments of the last year included the opening up of several new undeveloped areas in which were provided facilities for camping, picnicking, fishing, boating, and other forms of recreation. Our most outstanding accomplishment was the letting of construction contracts under the Bond Program whereby we are constructing the following units: Wister State Park, 1 duplex cabin; Beavers Bend State Park, 1 duplex cabin; Robbers Cave State Park, 2 duplex cabins; Boiling Springs State Park, 2 duplex cabins; Tenkiller State Park, 4 duplex cabins; Roman Nose State Park, one lodge with 20 rooms and dining facilities; Osage Hills State Park, a new swimming pool; Quartz Mountain State Park, a 50-room lodge with dining facilities and a new swimming pool; Lake Murray State Park lodge received a new convention hall and another wing of 20 rooms with four suites, and a new swimming pool; Sequoyah State Park received a 104-room lodge and dining facilities, with 18 cabins and a swimming pool; Lake Texoma State Park received a 106-room lodge with dining facilities, 50 cabins, a 20-room fishermen's lodge and a new swimming pool.

In addition to the above all park roads have been paved with a black-top asphalt type paving.

Our program for the next year will be to open and get into operation all of the above listed facilities. Opening date is scheduled for March 15, 1956.

Oregon. C. H. Armstrong, State Park Superintendent, reported:

The Oregon State Parks have enjoyed a very successful and busy year in that more people have visited the parks than ever before, numbering in excess of six million. The development of new areas and the enlargement of others has created greater interest and more opportunities for enjoyment by the people of the state and its visitors, this being reflected in the extraordinary amount of use. Overnight camping use has increased in the past year from 63,000 to slightly over 100,000, and the records indicate that it will probably number 150,000 campnights during the current year. The youth camp development and use has remained somewhat near the same, and amounted to approximately 24,000 for the year. Another type of use which is increasing, but not large, is the day group camping, which totaled approximately 2,700 for the year 1954. This figure may double for the year 1955.

New areas are being developed and others enlarged as our studies indicate the necessity. Our planning section has been very busy in the study of all areas as to their present and future demands. Plans are

under way to make the necessary enlargements and provide new areas wherever possible. In this connection, we have enlarged six areas for overnight camping use, and provided additional facilities in nearly all of the day use areas. Due to the great increase in use, it is necessary again to enlarge the overnight camping facilities for the year 1956 at Cape Lookout, Beverly Beach, Jessie M. Honeyman, and Humbug Mountain State Parks. These are all along the Oregon Coast, the great playground for the people of Oregon and their out-of-state guests.

We are in the process of developing facilities at six new areas, at Ochoco Lake in Central Oregon, Detroit Lake in the Cascades, Bandon on the Southern Oregon Coast, Fort Stevens on the Northern Oregon Coast, Susan Creek northeast of Roseburg, and an entirely new area at Wallawa Lake in Eastern Oregon.

We have added 1,093 acres to the park system during the past year at such areas as Fogarty Creek, Detroit Lake, Ochoco Lake, Fort Stevens, Susan Creek, and South Newport State Parks.

Our maintenance and operation forces have remained about the same as heretofore, with the addition of new forces at the newly acquired and developed areas. During the year 1954, our expenditures for construction and betterment in park areas, as well as roads, amounted to approximately \$360,000. The total expenditure for capital outlay was \$408,629. The operation of the park areas and roads amounted to \$431,189, while the administration was \$104,861, making a total operation and maintenance expenditures of \$536,050, or a total expenditure for all park activities for the year 1954 amounting to \$944,679, before applying a credit of \$91,985 for sales, services, and miscellaneous items.

The future of the Oregon State Parks is very bright in that we anticipate an annual increase in use of 10 to 15 percent. In the main, we have sufficient areas to accommodate this increase. Arrangements are being made to purchase additional land wherever a definite shortage is indicated, and altogether new areas where necessary. In this way the increase will be amply cared for, and the people of the State and their guests will enjoy the finest park facilities.

Pennsylvania. W. P. Moll, Chief, Division of Recreation, Department of Forests and Waters, reported:

Historic parks..... 11

State Parks..... 48

State Recreational Parks. 39

Forest park Monuments.. 13

111 areas, 150,000 acres and
2,000,000 acres of forest land

Attendance: 1953—5½ million park visitors

1954—9 million park visitors

1955—11 million by August

July 2-3-4 was a big week end with over a million park visitors.

Day users of state parks come in free. We have 20 organized group camps. From camping and cabins we received \$123,000 and from food concessions \$40,000. This all went to the State treasury, and from the State Treasury we received \$746,000 for capital improvements and \$875,000 for operation and maintenance, also \$150,000 for acquisition and development.

The State is investing six million dollars at Independence Hall in Philadelphia and seven million dollars at Fort Pitt in Pittsburgh.

We are developing 4 new areas, improving all areas and will establish Shawnee Park of 2700 acres on a flood-control dam.

Rhode Island. William H. Cotter, Jr., Chief, Department of Public Works, Division of Parks and Recreation, reported:

The goal of the Rhode Island Division of Parks and Recreation is to provide spotlessly clean, well maintained, safe beach, park, picnic and other recreational facilities which more nearly meet the healthful leisure time needs of our people. We believe that definite progress has been made during the past year toward this goal.

Capital improvements included the construction of hurricane resistant bathhouse facilities at both Block Island and Sand Hill Cove State Beaches, as well as a hurricane resistant boardwalk of a third of a mile in length at Scarborough State Beach. Surfaced parking facilities have been increased from 1000 to 2000 car capacity at Sand Hill Cove State Beach and from 1200 to 2300 car capacity at Scarborough State Beach.

Picnic facilities were increased generally throughout the State, in some cases by a small percentage, in others by as much as fifty percent. All recreational facilities were well on their way to an all time high in patronage until our people experienced the "cooling off" effects of hurricanes, "Connie" and "Diane." As a result we expect bathing receipts to be down slightly but all others to be above a year ago.

Safety has become a major concern of the Rhode Island Division. With this in mind we required that all lifeguard captains become water safety instructors and advanced first-aiders prior to State lifeguard certification tests. As during the previous year it was required that all regular lifeguards have an active senior lifesaving card and an active standard first aid card previous to the State tests. All beach managers, park managers, and park patrolmen have become either first aid instructors or advanced first-aiders.

This year, and for the first time, we provided the general public with a daily forecast of breaker height and general surf bathing conditions for the following day by using war tested oceanography techniques. The information proved to be of considerable value to water safety personnel and was well received by the bathing public.

The Rhode Island program for the coming year includes the development of recreational facilities for the physically handicapped, the opening of new lighted areas for public skating, the development of fishermen's boat landing areas wherever possible and feasible, and programs for the continued training of beach, park, and lifeguard personnel in order to qualify them for additional services to the general public.

Texas. Prepared by Gordon K. Shearer, Executive Secretary, Texas State Parks Board, read by Mrs. Ethel W. Harris, Custodian, San Jose Mission.

Legislative approval was given by Texas this year to the Texas State Parks Board policy of major improvements through revenue bonds. The Board has felt that it had this power under the original act creating the Board. Some legislators thought differently and bills were offered specifically forbidding such procedure. Not only were these negative bills defeated, but the Legislature went on to pass an affirmative act formally approving the \$25,000,000 revenue bond resolution of the Texas State Parks Board.

After serving the customary two terms as Chairman of the Texas State Parks Board, Frank D. Quinn, who has been re-appointed for another six-year membership on the Board, said he felt the customary limit should be observed. New Chairman is Mr. Andrew M. Howsley of Albany, Texas, a new member of the Board. Member Maurice E. Turner of Huntsville became vice-chairman succeeding Mr. Lonnie C. Fuller, who also declined re-election.

In addition to the funds that will become available for capital improvements through sale of revenue bonds, \$40,000 was appropriated by the Legislature for needed repairs and maintenance of Goliad State Park, one of several historical areas, transferred recently to Texas State Parks Board supervision.

A citizens fund is being raised for another important historic area. This is Washington-on-the-Brazos, the site of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence from Mexico, and seat of the government of the Republic of Texas. Col. John C. Diggs of the National Park Service, in August, assisted in studies of the work to be done at both these sites.

Principal land acquisition of the year was a 525-acre site at Falcon Reservoir on the Rio Grande. Cooperatively, the Board helped negotiate the acquisition by Ward County of an unusual area known as Monahans Sands, similar to the White Sands National Site in New Mexico.

The program for next year will be studied at a meeting of the Board to be held next month. At that time, there likely will be definite action on the revenue bond developments. Not more than five million of the possible 25 million bonds will be issued as a starter.

Vermont. Robert G. Simon, Supervisor of Parks, reported:

Vermont is about two hundred miles long, fifty miles wide at the southern end and eighty-five miles wide at the northern end of the State. It has 9,124 square miles or 5,839,360 acres with a population of 377,747 people.

With a forest area of 3,504,000 acres, Vermont has only around 83,644 acres in State Parks and Forests.

At the present time, Vermont has twenty-four State Parks with an area of 6,600 acres and 26 State Forests comprising an area of 81,000 acres. Fourteen of the State Parks and ten of the twenty-four State Forests have recreational developments.

In comparison to New York State, it is about 1/5 the size in area, and having 1/38 of the population. Rhode Island, the smallest state had 644 people per square mile. New York has 264 people to Vermont's 41. Although Vermont is comparatively small, she is near large centers of population and the people in the nearby States are visiting the Green Mountain State in larger numbers each year. So Vermont really has to go beyond her own needs in recreational developments.

Washington. John R. Vanderzicht, Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission, reported:

During 1955, the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission has continued negotiation for new park sites and additional developments at existing sites.

West of the Cascade Mountains the State of Washington has continued its policy of acquisition of park sites with waterfront. We have purchased approximately 200 acres in the northwest part of the State in an area called Birch Bay, and plan extensive development. Near Tacoma, on Puget Sound, we have completed negotiations for another waterfront site on Henderson Bay. Still under negotiation are three areas, formerly part of the 1898 west coast defenses of the United States—Fort Casey on Whidby Island; Fort Flagler on Marrowstone Island; and Fort Canby on Cape Disappointment, near the mouth of the Columbia River. Plans are also underway for a peninsula tip on the ocean north of Long Beach, Washington.

On the east side of the mountains a new ski area has been built on the east side of Mount Spokane. Construction this summer included road and parking, a ski lodge, and three double rope tows. Private capital is also spending \$200,000 for a chair lift, the longest in the northwest.

To care for increasing population needs in the Columbia Basin in Central Washington where many dams and reservoirs are being built as part of that great irrigation and power development, we are negotiating with appropriate government agencies for a chain of areas throughout the basin. These recreational areas will extend from Wallula

Lake in southeastern Washington north to, and including, the Equalizing Reservoir which receives irrigation waters from Grand Coulee Dam. Agreements on some of these areas have already been reached, others are in process.

Acquisition of all sites is in keeping with Commission policy to provide for a growing population 50 years ahead. Another expanded policy is to provide more maximum use of park areas. More people are camping in state parks, and more choice of recreational activity provided where they camp. In this we have the assistance of other state agencies such as the State Game Department in their fish-stocking program and the Department of Fisheries in clam conservation.

In providing maximum-use parks, historical site development, boat moorages, etc., Washington is not only providing variety of choice for citizens but offering inducements to tourists to come to Washington and stay longer. Our state parks do much for the State's third largest industry—the tourist—making us both a public service and a valuable contributor to the State's economy.

Funds for expenditure in the 1955–57 biennium include \$855,600 for capital outlay; \$400,000 for purchase, condemnation and improvement of land; \$490,000 for operations, and \$950,000 for salaries, a total of \$2,695,600.

West Virginia. H. M. Harr, Assistant Chief, Division of State Parks, reported:

In 1953, the West Virginia Legislature authorized the Conservation Commission to sell Revenue Bonds for the development of single State parks. In 1955, legislation was passed enabling seven of West Virginia's twenty-one State parks to be joined in a feasibility report and over-all anticipated Revenue plan as well as in sale of \$3,100,000 in bonds for an entire State-wide park expansion program designed to make these seven major parks self-supporting.

In the past, West Virginia State parks were able to accommodate only 20 percent of the demand made upon them. Now, as a major part of the vast new development, a total of eighty-five deluxe, modern cabins are being built. Two lodges, one a forty-eight (48) bedroom unit at Cacapon State Park and the other a fifty-five room lodge at Blackwater Falls State Park are scheduled for completion next year.

Two areas, recently acquired, are being developed as State parks under the Revenue Bond program. Mont Chateau State Park located on Cheat Lake will have a forty room lodge and Bluestone State Park situated on 1,500 acre Bluestone Reservoir will have fifteen (15) cabins and a forty (40) person overnight fisherman's lodge, as well as a trailer camp and tenting area.

Before Revenue bonds allowed the expansion of West Virginia's twenty-one (21) State Parks, more than one million and a half visitors

took advantage of the recreational opportunities afforded. Only a few of these, however, were able to secure overnight and vacation facilities. Now it is expected that these same people who annually enjoy the scenic splendor of the State's parks will more than keep up with the rapid expansion of a vacationland where they can find food, lodging, and unlimited recreational opportunity close at hand in the Mountain State of West Virginia.

Wisconsin. C. L. Harrington, Supt. of Forests and Parks, reported:

The state park program in Wisconsin has always been closely associated with the state forestry activities. The use of state land originally intended for the growing of a timber crop is more and more being used by the public for recreational purposes. The general trend of thinking now is that, in effect, areas for development in the state forests take on the aspects of a state park right in the middle of a state forest boundary. This applies particularly to camping, picnicking, hiking and similar outdoor needs. In addition, of course, the recreation of hunting applies to all state forest lands, but in areas of intensive use there is a tendency to restrict hunting or trapping. Such activities are prohibited on the state parks.

This overlapping of public-use patterns has an important influence on all affairs that apply to state park or forest lands. While the financing of the state forest program is adequate and stable (2 tenths of a mill on the assessed value of the State), the problem of financing the state parks is still not satisfactorily solved. The legislature still directs that a part of the hunting and fishing license moneys be devoted to the state park work. This is disliked by fishing and hunting organizations, for the most part, but does receive support from the citizens generally. It is true that the state general fund is making an increasing contribution as the years go by to the park program. Legislative committees have been working on this problem for about six years with an intensity of effort, and all arrangements that have been tried to raise money for state parks among the other states have been explored. The legislative session of 1955 has voted somewhat of an increased operational budget for the coming biennium, but the state park needs are outrunning the means provided to supply them. I can report, however, that a special capital fund of \$500,000 has been made available to be used for sanitary facilities, domestic water supplies, shelters and other similar public needs. We face the problem of applying this money to three to five million dollars of work that would be really desirable on the parks and to set up priorities among the 30 state parks requiring attention of varying degree. The department is pleased, of course, to have this substantial help from the legislature during a session marked by many pressing and important demands for money otherwise. It is the first time the state parks were treated so well.

The sentiment for the state park program in the State is a very healthy one. The Conservation Commission has approved of the establishment of a new area on the northeastern shore of Lake Winnebago to serve the needs of the industrial Fox River Valley. This approval was the result of the interest of the people from that part of the State. It did not arise from the seat of government itself but entirely from the rural areas and cities in that part of the State. It is the first time in the history of the State that the designation of the term Forest-Park will be used. The frontage and limestone escarpment area that will form the significant part of this development is the last remaining more or less intensively undeveloped stretch on Lake Winnebago. While the area has been subjected to a phase of surface disturbance for many years, including the operation of a large quarry, still it is the best area for park purposes in that part of Wisconsin.

In conclusion, may I say that in Wisconsin the spirit of the people for all park and forest work is vigorously good. The annual attendance is increasing in practically all such public use areas. The arrangement, through the State Highway Commission, for all road work which has been the pattern in Wisconsin for many years still continues. As we all know, the expense of construction and maintenance of access and interior roads constitutes about the heaviest over-all expense in any state park, and when this can be financed with dependability is a long step forward. Such has been the case in Wisconsin for years. We have a fine understanding with all other state agencies interested in the state park program. Not only the State Highway Commission, but the Historical Society, Archeological Society and Survey, Scientific Area Board, Department of Public Instruction and similar other concerned public boards actively cooperate with the Conservation Department in state park work and development. While we are short of money in most respects to do what is really needed, still we have every reason to be encouraged for the future outlook for the state parks of Wisconsin.

PRESENTED AT THE NATIONAL CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON PARKS AND OPEN SPACES BY THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION, ACTING WITH THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PARK EXECUTIVES, COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS, HELD AT WASHINGTON, D. C. MAY 22-25, 1955.

Establishment and Protection of State Parks

V. W. FLICKINGER, Chief, Division of Parks,
Department of Natural Resources, Columbus, Ohio

UNDER present-day conditions few park administrators have the opportunity of selecting, and developing, a state recreation system from its beginning. In most instances a park executive is in charge of a system conceived and created by others, and with an already established pattern of protection, maintenance, and operation. Consequently, he has had little to say about acquisition or development. Others may have a system which has been created by the transfer of properties from various agencies to a newly created Division of Parks.

The number of States not having a recreation system is small. In some of those which lack facilities there are signs which indicate that the establishment of a system is being considered. In these instances there may be the opportunity to build a state recreation system, using the experience of others, and taking into consideration various factors which are so essential in the establishment of a state park system.

All of us will agree that there are many factors upon which the success of any undertaking will depend. The most important single factor in any field is the human element. Ask any administrator what is his greatest problem, and *personnel* is his immediate reply. Experience has proven conclusively that the quality of personnel retained by those responsible for the system, will determine the success of that system. The executive head of the system should be an individual who understands the various technical fields, and how he may best use their technical skills and knowledge. He must have a knowledge of the overall land use program and the basic resource problem. He should have a specialized knowledge of the unique administrative problems of a state recreation system, and how they may be solved effectively and economically. This knowledge will assist and influence his decisions in the establishment and protection of a state park system.

In the establishment of our state park system of today and for tomorrow, there are various factors upon which recreation depends; the following should be taken into consideration:

1. Leisure time.
2. Income available for recreation.

3. Distance and time required for travel.
4. Facilities available.
5. Surroundings in which facilities are situated.
6. Cost involved for occupancy or use of facilities.
7. Maintenance of area and facilities.

We must recognize that during the past five years there has been a definite change in recreational habits brought about by a continued prosperity, full employment and a shorter work week resulting in more leisure time. There are indications of an even shorter work week together with a guaranteed annual wage. These factors will have a definite influence on the establishment and protection of our state park system.

The planning of a state park system and its components is not an exact science such as mathematics. No two individuals will approach the problem in the same manner. Study, research, pooling of experience gained over long periods, and under a great variety of conditions have provided a basis for guidance in determining area and facility requirements. There is no standard pattern, formula or theorem for such planning. There is also a lack of basic design data, so essential for successful planning and development in the field.

Since there are infinite variations in population distribution, and it is constantly changing, economic status, transportation, climate, character, quality and quantity of lands available, and other pertinent factors which vary with each locale, no *city, county, state or regional* plan can be *superimposed upon any other area*. Each is an entity in itself, and each must be formulated upon conditions and facts found in the area to be served.

When preparing the systemic plan, the administrator and planner should take into consideration the following:

1. Population density and its recreation requirements in kind, quantity and quality.
2. Recreational habits of users in the area served.
3. Amount of land necessary to meet these requirements.
4. Lands available, suitable, and economically feasible for the type of recreation to be provided and not more valuable for uses other than recreation.

There are also other integrants, which he should keep in mind. Careful planning, not only in the economy of development, protection, maintenance, operation and use, but also, the impression created upon the visitor.

As systemic requirements are satisfied and the plan takes shape it becomes apparent that not all areas under consideration are worthy of inclusion in the system, and neither can or should they be developed along the same plan or pattern. As the planner views them, he will find that he is unconsciously classifying them according to a criterion based upon a development which will make accessible to the visitor

the important and interesting features of the property, at the same time providing for proper protection, without impairment of those values and qualities which make the area desirable.

Unlike business and industry, wherein a standard nomenclature has been established, there is no uniformly accepted classification of state park areas. Some States use the term "state parks" universally and apply it to all areas in the system. Most States have some type of classification based upon custom, use, character, or statutory provision. There are currently in use some sixty odd classifications. This variance from State to State is confusing and misleading to the visitors.

Recognizing the dilemma of this situation, the speaker during his term as President of the National Conference on State Parks appointed a committee to study this condition. The result was the preparation of a report, entitled "Suggested Criteria for Evaluating Areas Proposed for Inclusion in State Park Systems," which was adopted by the Board of Directors at the 1954 annual meeting of the Conference.

It is the hope of those who served on this committee "that the criteria may serve as standards for use by the States." For the purpose of evaluation, as set forth in this report the state park areas are grouped into six classifications: Parks, Monuments, Recreation Areas, Beaches, Parkways and Waysides. (Since this report is published and available from the National Conference on State Parks, the contexts are not included in this paper).

In our systemic requirements, we should recognize that each system as a whole should—

1. "Conserve outstanding examples of the state's natural and cultural resources for the inspiration and benefit of the public."
2. "Provide non-urban recreation opportunities for the State's citizens and visitors that are normally beyond the responsibility of the state's political sub-divisions."

It has been our experience that regardless of how we define or classify a state park, irrespective of its size, character or scenic value, the man in the street applies the term "state park" to any area, or tract of ground owned by the State and used for recreational purposes, regardless of physical characteristics, development or use. Another definition might be "public lands set aside or dedicated for recreation or pleasure," or also defined as "public lands, set aside for the preservation of outdoor values, scenic, scientific or historic features, and made available to the citizens for recreation and pleasure for years to come."

Under present day conditions the park administrator is rarely confronted with a major acquisition program. In most instances he is forced to restudy and develop for maximum use, areas which are already in existence. Limited acquisition may be required for more efficient utilization and development of the existing area to meet increased demands.

There are individuals in the audience who have experienced a substantial acquisition program for a state park system. From personal experience, of nearly a quarter of a century, in two different state park organizations, the speaker has experienced acquisition problems for effigy Mounds National Monument, seven new state parks, two new beach parks, as well as the acquisition of numerous small parcels for additions to existing areas.

In the selection of new areas, or in adding to already existing holdings the following items should receive study:

1. Topography: Mountains, hills, bluffs, gorges, dunes, moraines, plains, and caves.
2. Water: Ocean, gulf, lake, river, streams, waterfalls, springs, underground rivers and beaches.
3. Vegetative Cover: Forests, prairie, meadow, swamp and bogs.
4. History: Historical sites, buildings, other evidences of historical interest, canals and locks, trails and traces, treaty sites, and villages.
5. Archaeological: Mounds, earthworks, villages, burial grounds.
6. Scientific: Geological interest. Areas in which there is a variety of plant and animal life, natural scenery, and which show the processes of the formation of the country.
7. Wildlife: Areas which may involve various combinations of the above and providing suitable habitat for the continued support of wildlife in its native state.

Each system and area constitutes an individual problem in planning and development. Certain facilities will be required in every park regardless of classification, others are common to many, and in some the development will be of a special nature in order to bring out certain highlights, or points of interest. The planner must always remember that area establishment and planning involve:

1. Reconnaissance in advance of acquisition.
2. Determination of the logical and economical relationship among the several items of development which appear to be required or desirable.
3. Modification of natural environment only when it is certain that the values resulting will fully balance the losses.

We have of necessity limited our remarks. Many fine articles have been written on the details of planning state parks, both from the administrators' and planners' points of view. The 1952 Yearbook on Park and Recreation Progress, published by the National Conference on State Parks, has two excellent articles on the above subjects.

So far our remarks have been confined to the establishment phase of our subject. We should also consider, another one of the components in our park program; *that of protection*. This phase is of equal importance as compared to maintenance, development and operation. Park people recognize the necessity of an adequate protection program.

On May 13, 1918, a statement of National Park Policy was outlined in a letter from Secretary Franklin K. Lane to Director Stephen T. Mather. The first paragraph is as follows, "The National Park Service has been established as a bureau of this Department just one year. During this period our efforts have been chiefly directed toward the building of an effective organization while engaged in the performance of duties relating to the administration, *protection*, and improvements of the national parks as required by law."

In the legislation creating the Division of Parks in the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, effective August 11, 1949, the Legislature gave the *protection* phase of the Division's activities equal weight with its other duties. The act reads as follows: "The Division of Parks shall have the right, power, and duty to create, supervise, operate, *protect* and maintain a system of state parks and to promote the use thereof by the public."

Again in the "Criteria for the Selection of State Parks" we find the words, "or which would in the foreseeable future possess such qualities and attractiveness if adequate *protection* and access were made available—."

From the above citations, and from other sources there is sufficient evidence and implication that once areas are established their continued protection is of paramount importance.

Why do we need to protect our parks, from whom and what? What do we mean by protection? How do we go about it? All of these questions may be asked by the visitors who take parks for granted.

The park administrator has some of the answers, and is willing to discuss with visitors the necessity of protective measures required to safeguard the inherent, intrinsic and esthetic values which are the soul of the area, and which make it outstanding.

Webster defines the word "protect" as follows: "To cover or shield, from injury or destruction; to defend, and to guard." Here we have the implication that the word protect includes not only the prevention of vandalism to the natural features and physical facilities, but that it also includes guarding against other encroachments upon the public holdings.

A brief visit with a park manager, ranger, naturalist or administrator on the subject of protection cannot help but impress the visitor with the necessity of protecting the intangible values, and the physical features of the public domain.

From whom must we protect? The worst offender: the careless and thoughtless park visitor. When he visits a park he seems to be motivated by an impulse to leave a memento of his visit such as: his initials carved on a picnic table, shelter house, bench, sign or rock face; lipstick on toilet walls; kleenex and tin cans in reflecting pools; and litter of all kinds. Ever visit a park on the day after a holiday? Try it some time,

the results will be enlightening.

There is also the problem of encroachments. For example, the proposal to utilize Rock Creek Parkway in the Capital City for expressway purposes because there will be low land costs, or the construction of Echo Dam in Dinosaur National Park. All under the guise of progress, in each instance destroying an intangible for which the area was originally set aside.

Daily the state park administrator is besieged with requests of individuals seeking to capitalize, or derive personal gain from the visitor potential in a state park in the form of concession privileges, which are classed as alien to the state park concept, such as carnival type amusements in a day-use area, or for the establishment of non-essential food and drink concessions in apparently strategic locations; the establishment of beer gardens and liquor licenses at, or in close proximity, to the entrances of parks; through highways in state parks; for permission to erect private cottages along the lake shores of artificial impoundments, constructed for public use from public funds, and on public lands; and many others.

Yes, the features of Nature must be protected for those who come to enjoy their rightful heritage, from selfish individuals who would capitalize upon them.

Colonel Lieber said, "State Parks are the show windows of the State." Certainly, they would not be show windows long, if it were not for the protective measures which have been taken for the safeguarding of their natural values.

How may we go about protecting the public domain? The following will serve as a guide. There are many others, but time does not permit their listing:

1. *Adequate buffer lands on all sides.* Many of our protection problems could have been very effectively handled by the purchase of adequate take strips or border lands. Where state parks are located within the confines of the state forest holdings, there are for the most part adequate buffer lands which preclude undesirable encroachment in the form of fringe businesses bent on capitalizing on state development and state park-visitors.

2. *Natural or physical barriers.* When selecting areas for acquisition there are ordinarily logical or natural barriers or boundaries, such as roads, gorges, rivers and lakes. These are easily identified and serve as natural separation points. Physical barriers or man-made controls will be in the form of boundary fencing, expensive but mandatory at times, guard rail or other protective works or devices. We all dislike looking through a wire mesh, or wrought iron grill at some historical article or valuable art object, but if such a protective device were not there, the

object or work would be so mutilated or reduced to such a shamble that it would no longer be of value. WHY? That is the question the park people would like to have answered.

3. *Zoning.* Under the zoning process it is possible through the co-operation of the citizens in the communities where state parks may be situated to prescribe the use of lands abutting state park holdings. In Ohio, county zoning is possible under the provisions of Section 3180-1 of the General Code, which stipulates how the zoning commission is to be constituted, its duties, how and what lands are to be zoned. There has been some interest as far as park lands are concerned, but so far no actual zoning has occurred.

4. *Ranger, Park Police, Patrolman.* Regardless of title, still a guard or protector of the parks from vandalism. He should be in a distinctive and proper uniform at all times. Much of the time he will not be on the scene when needed, but his presence on the areas will be a deterrent for overt acts of destruction. An expensive though effective and necessary method which will vary with every state park system, but extremely essential for the protection of flora, fauna, and public property as well as the park visitor.

5. *Outdoor Education.* Roberts Mann, Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois said:

Great masses of the American people, now predominately urban do not know how to behave themselves in a park; they have no respect for or appreciation of Nature; they have no respect for public property; they have no roots, no sense of kinship with the land, and what little knowledge they have of Nature is distorted by misinformation or colored by fear.

The objectives of outdoor education may be simply stated,

- (a) Teach people to appreciate Nature and understand Nature's laws.
- (b) Enable them to live intelligently and find enjoyment in the out-of-doors.
- (c) Give them understanding of the vital need for wise management and use of our natural resources, and an ingrained feeling of personal responsibility for their conservation.

Yes, protection is of equal importance with the creation, operation and maintenance. It is possible to complete each phase, but if we do not have protection, that which has been created by the Almighty and over which we have nominal custodianship, will soon become shabby, or have its intrinsic and inherent value forever destroyed through misuse, and once lost it can never be replaced.

We, as park minded citizens, can, through the avenues open to us, encourage the expansion of existing facilities, and the establishment of new areas, be they city, metropolitan, county, or state, to accommodate present day needs, and anticipate future requirements. As we maintain high scenic values; resist destructive pressures and encroachment; furnish adequate protection, and supply essential facilities for the comfort of our visitors, then we shall have achieved the preservation of our natural heritage, and our sources of inspiration.

State Control of Roadside Vegetation

DAVID R. LEVIN, Chief, Land Studies Section,
Financial and Administrative Research Branch, Bureau of Public Roads

INTRODUCTION

THIS National Citizens Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People is to be commended for its current emphasis upon a problem that is presently tantalizing us. It involves the matter of how to modernize a highway plant of another era and, at the same time, blend and integrate the resulting product into a physical environment, so that a maximum of safety, function, and amenity is achieved for both the transportation facility and adjacent uses.

I need hardly tell this expert audience that this objective is not easy to accomplish. It can be achieved, of course, through proper geometric design of the highway facilities. The objective can also be facilitated by appropriate legal and administrative tools with which to foster, protect and provide for roadside vegetation. It is this latter aspect of the problem to which I would like to address myself this morning.

OBJECTIVES OF ROADSIDE VEGETATION

We might ask ourselves at the outset what specific ends will be served by the appropriate provision and public control of roadside planting. A program of roadside vegetation will

- (1) promote safety on the highway;
- (2) prevent erosion and its devastating consequences, such as increased cost of maintenance and traffic hazards;
- (3) screen undesirable and sometimes obnoxious structures, objects and uses along the highway corridors;
- (4) reduce noise from the highway facility and its impact on adjacent uses;
- (5) insulate roadside areas from fumes and other undesirable by-products of motorized transportation; and generally
- (6) assist in establishing a pleasant and more natural environment for both the highway traveler and the abutting property owner or occupant.

There may be other objectives that are served by an appropriate program of roadside vegetation.

NATURE OF ROADSIDE AREAS

Once we concede that there are compelling reasons why it is very much in the public interest to provide and regulate roadside planting, we might well attempt to delineate the character of the area so involved. The American Association of State Highway Officials defines the "roadside" as a general term denoting the area adjoining the outer edge of the roadway, and may include extensive areas between the roadways of a divided highway. This area, perforce, could extend from the outer edge of the roadway to the right-of-way boundary, as well as beyond

the right-of-way boundary and into the adjoining private property. For physically and functionally, the character and uses of the roadside affect the character and uses of the roadway itself.

Since State laws concerning the provisions and control of roadside vegetation distinguish between the highway right-of-way and the areas in private ownership beyond the right-of-way, it is well to take cognizance of this distinction in discussing the matter today.

LANDSCAPING WITHIN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY

I cite an unpublished 1951 survey of State laws made by the Bureau of Public Roads.

State laws dealing with vegetation sometimes involve (1) the provision of new planting by public authority, (2) the protection and maintenance of existing vegetation, and (3) the regulation of the provision of vegetation by private individuals, groups or organizations. Each of these groups of laws ought to be considered separately.

Incidentally, no statutory provisions relating to the control of vegetation by the State highway departments could be found in the following 17 jurisdictions:

Alabama	Montana	Tennessee
Arizona	Nevada	Texas
Arkansas	New Mexico	Wyoming
Colorado	North Dakota	District of Columbia
Georgia	South Carolina	Hawaii
Mississippi	South Dakota	

A special task force on planning and management of roadside vegetation of the Committee on Roadside Development of the Highway Research Board has recently asserted that States should revise their existing laws or provide new laws wherever necessary to entrust the highway department with responsibility for the establishment and maintenance of all vegetation along the highways over which it exercises jurisdiction. See **PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF ROADSIDE VEGETATION**, Special Task Committee on Planning and Management of Roadside Vegetation, Nelson M. Wells, Chairman.

PROVISION OF NEW VEGETATION BY PUBLIC AUTHORITY

An analysis of State laws on roadside vegetation reveals that 16 States have legislation authorizing the State highway departments to carry on planting operations within the highway right-of-way, in accordance with a planned program of roadside improvement. These include the following:

Connecticut	Michigan	Rhode Island
Delaware	New Hampshire	Utah
Florida	New Jersey	Virginia
Louisiana	New York	Washington
Maine	Pennsylvania	Wisconsin
Maryland		

The Florida statute is illustrative: and other examples included in this paper are used as illustrations only, and are not suggested as model provisions necessarily.

The State Roads Department . . . may include as a part of (its) program of highway construction, repair, maintenance or upkeep, the conservation of the natural roadside growths and scenery, and the beautification of highways, roads, or streets by the restoration, planting, replanting, seeding and reseedling of grasses, plants, shrubs, root stocks, or trees, and the maintenance of same along the roadsides of all highways. (Florida Stats. Ann., 1944, Title 24, Ch. 342, Sec. 342.01.)

PROTECTION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING VEGETATION

There is already a considerable body of statutory law providing for the protection and care of existing vegetation by the State highway department. The laws of at least 13 States permit the State highway department to trim, cut, or remove vegetation in the highway right-of-way. These include the following States:

Connecticut	Michigan	Pennsylvania
Illinois	Minnesota	Utah
Maine	New York	Washington
Maryland	Ohio	Wisconsin
Massachusetts		

The New York law is illustrative of this type of legislation:

The Superintendent of Public Works may provide for removal of, or trimming of any trees within the boundaries of State highways necessary for convenience or preservation of the highway. (Baldwin's Consolidated Laws, 1938, Highway Law, Art. 2, Sec. 11 (7).)

In a larger group of States—25—the State highway department is authorized to control the trimming, cutting and removal of vegetation by others in the highway rights-of-way. Included are these States:

California	Massachusetts	Oregon
Connecticut	Michigan	Pennsylvania
Florida	Nebraska	Rhode Island
Idaho	New Hampshire	Utah
Indiana	New Jersey	Vermont
Kansas	New York	Washington
Kentucky	North Carolina	West Virginia
Louisiana	Ohio	Wisconsin
Maryland		

The North Carolina law is of this type:

. . . no tree or shrub in or on any State road or State highway shall be planted, trimmed, or removed, and no obstruction placed thereon, without a written permit, as hereinbefore provided for, and then only in accordance with the regulations of the commission or its duly authorized officers or employees; and the work shall be done under the supervision and to the satisfaction of the

commission or its officers or employees, and the expense of replacing the highway in as good condition as before shall be paid by the persons, firms or corporations to whom the permit is given, or by whom the work is done. (North Carolina General Stats. 1943, Ch. 136, Sec. 93.)

An adjunct to this authority of the State highway department is provision for the eradication of noxious weeds or growths of any kind within the rights-of-way of State highways. The statutes of at least six States include this provision, in these instances:

Iowa
Kansas
New York

Oregon
Rhode Island
Virginia

The Rhode Island law may be cited as an example of this type of legislation:

The Division of Roads and Bridges may remove trees or other plants within the limits of public highways under its jurisdiction which are injurious plants or are obnoxious as hosts of insects or fungus pests. (General Laws Rhode Island, 1938, Ch. 225, Sec. 5.)

REGULATION OF PROVISION OF VEGETATION BY OTHERS

The provision of vegetation within the highway rights-of-way is frequently undertaken by abutting owners or private groups or individuals or organizations other than the State highway departments. The laws of 12 jurisdictions authorize the State highway departments to control plantings in the highway rights-of-way, sometimes by use of a permit system and regulations promulgated by the State highway department. These include:

California
Illinois
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
New Hampshire

North Carolina
Ohio
Utah
Washington
West Virginia
Hawaii

The following Maryland enactment is typical:

No State highway shall be dug up for laying or placing pipes . . . and no trees shall be planted or removed or obstructions placed thereon without the written permit of the State Roads Commission, or its duly authorized agent, and then only in accordance with the regulations of said commission; and the work shall be done under the supervision of and to the satisfaction of said Commission. (Flacks Ann. Code of Maryland, 1939, Ch. 89B, Sec. 21.)

The more general laws controlling planting by others in the highway rights-of-way authorize the State highway department to make such rules and regulations as are considered to be in the best interests of the State. The New Hampshire law is illustrative:

On all State maintained highways, the planting, acquisition, maintenance and removal of all trees and shrubs shall be done under the supervision of the State highway commissioner who shall make such rules and regulations for the purpose as shall, in his judgment, seem for the best interests of the State. (Laws 1945, Ch. 188, Sec. 15.)

The type of legal interest which a State acquired in its highway rights-of-way sometimes influences the State policy with respect to roadside vegetation that is written into its statutes. Some States acquire a fee simple title to its highway rights-of-way; the resulting legal control which this facilitates is quite complete. Other States, however, traditionally acquire only an easement for highway purposes in perpetuity, and the underlying fee continues to remain in the abutting property owner; under such circumstances, and where the prevailing legal mores of the State or community so dictate, may seek the approval of the abutting property owner to planting in the highway right-of-way by others than the State highway department. The laws of at least two States—Illinois and Maine—so provide.

VEGETATION BEYOND THE RIGHT-OF-WAY

As I have already suggested, the safety of the highway traveler and his more expeditious journey are frequently affected by the nature and location of the vegetation in the areas beyond the highway right-of-way, as well as by vegetation within the right-of-way. The laws of a few States have taken full cognizance of this important principle by making provision for planting by the State highway department in areas adjacent to the highway right-of-way wherever considered necessary to carry out a planned program of roadside improvement. Six States have authority of this kind, varying in degree, however:

California
Connecticut
Massachusetts

Oregon
Utah
Vermont

The California statute is an example:

The department may acquire, either in fee or in any lesser estate or interest, any real property which it considers necessary for State highway purposes. Real property for such purposes includes, but is not limited to, real property considered necessary for (the following purposes): . . . the culture and support of trees which benefit any State highway by aiding in the maintenance and preservation of the roadbed, or which aid in the maintenance of the attractiveness of the scenic beauties of such highway. (Deerings California Code, 1945, Streets and Highways, Art. 2, Sec. 104.)

Aside from an active program of planting by the State highway department in the areas adjacent to the right-of-way, four States authorize some control by the department of the cutting, trimming and removal of vegetation in such areas. Safety objectives seem to

be the determining factor in such instances, and the consent of the abutting landowner is frequently necessary. The four States are:

Massachusetts
Pennsylvania

Utah
Virginia

The Massachusetts law is of this type:

The Department, if it can obtain consent of the owner, shall remove the trees, limbs of trees, shrubbery or any structure or other obstacle from lands bordering on State highways, which in its opinion obstruct the view of persons traveling upon the highway or make traveling thereon dangerous. (Ann. Laws of Massachusetts, Recompiled, 1945, Ch. 81, Sec. 14.)

ACQUISITION OF EASEMENTS TO CONTROL ROADSIDE VEGETATION

Most of the public controls discussed in the foregoing paragraphs concern the regulation of roadside vegetation under the State's police power, for which no compensation from government is forthcoming. A few States, however, have sought to exercise control of roadside vegetation by the acquisition of special easements, under the power of eminent domain, involving compensation, theoretically at least.

A prototype of such legislation exists in a Maryland statute:

The State Roads Commission may acquire, by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, real property along or near any State highway, parkway or freeway, or any interest in such property, in order to protect the highway, parkway, or freeway, or scenery along or near it, or to provide parking areas along the highway, parkway or freeway and for similar purposes.

Among the interests in land which may be so acquired are agreements or easements restricting, or subjecting to regulation by the Commission, any right of the owner or other persons—

- (3) to remove or destroy shrubbery or trees;
- (4) to place thereon trash or unsightly or offensive material;
- (5) to display thereon signs, billboards or advertisements

Where any interest in real property is acquired under this section, the deed, agreement, judgment, or other instrument shall clearly set forth the specific restrictions or other interests purchased, condemned, or otherwise acquired and any such restrictions shall run with the land to which they apply and be binding on all subsequent holders, except as the deed, agreement, judgment, or decree or other instrument otherwise expressly provides. (Laws of Maryland, 1941, Ch. 486.)

It is altogether possible, of course, that other States may possess the power to acquire easements of this kind, even without the benefit of specific legislation on the subject. This may follow from the right such States possess to acquire property or any interests in property, for highway purposes generally.

CONCLUSION

It is quite obvious, then, that we have really made progress with respect to the provision and control of vegetation, both within the

highway rights-of-way, and perhaps to a lesser degree, in the areas immediately adjacent thereto. But in terms of the needs, much remains to be done. We must lift the "roadsides" out of the mud, just as we did the same—literally—many years ago with respect to rural highways. Only then will we have achieved the ultimate in terms of transportation facilities that are safe, efficient and pleasant to utilize. And only then will the man-made accommodation have been blended appropriately into a natural environment and reconciled functionally with the pattern of roadside uses.

Roadsides and the Federal Highway System

BURTON W. MARSH, Director, Traffic Engineering and Safety Department,
American Automobile Association

THE ROADSIDE is the most neglected aspect of the highway program today.

We simply cannot afford to let this situation continue.

Take for example the matter of obtaining adequate right-of-way. Here is what H. S. Fairbank, one of our topmost highway leaders in America, recently had to say:

"When shall we ever learn? Time after time, we find that 10 or 15 years after purchasing a right-of-way of inadequate width, we have to buy, at greatly increased cost, additional right-of-way or go to a new location.

"Failure to secure adequate rights-of-way is perhaps the most serious basic fault in highway practice today."

Yes, conditions as to the roadside aspect of the highway problem are serious today. But, what of the future?

The Future Problem: Let us compare the situation today with the best available estimates of traffic growth:

1. There are now over 58,000,000 registered vehicles in the United States—1 to every 2.8 persons.

2. A short decade from now, by 1965, it is estimated that there will be almost 3 motor vehicles to every 2 today.

3. By 1975, the estimate is that there will be 4 vehicles for every 2 today.

Now, these estimates are not made by some starry-eyed dreamers. No indeed, they are the estimates of leading highway transportation officials—and let me emphasize that heretofore, major estimates of traffic growth have consistently been on the low side—and very much on the low side. In other words, highway traffic has grown much faster than has been anticipated.

Traffic Growth Outstripping Highway Improvements: Another major factor in the picture is that traffic growth has been greatly outrunning highway improvements. Indeed so great has the gap become that President Eisenhower recently announced a figure of \$101 billion as the amount needed to take care of the present deficiency and to provide reasonably adequate highway facilities for the next 10 years. (In the case of the National System of Interstate Highways, to provide facilities adequate for the next 20 years.) This estimate is based on analysis prepared by the state highway departments in accordance with procedures and forms which that Association and the Bureau of Public Roads developed.

It is a startling deficiency, isn't it?

Will Road Improvements Continue to Lag? It is a fair question of whether, as the number of motor vehicles increases so rapidly, we shall find ourselves getting caught up and staying caught up in the provision of highway facilities. Much as I dislike stating it, it is my judgment that the road improvement will continue to lag behind growing motor vehicle registration and traffic demands. This does not mean that we shall not have some tremendous highway improvement programs in the years ahead, for I am sure that we shall. But I am equally sure that even with those improvements, we must look forward to less road space per car as time goes on.

Implications—Better Disciplined Traffic; Better Roadside Protection: If this appraisal is correct, then it seems crystal clear that we must take measures to assure more efficiency and orderliness in the use of the highway facilities which we have. We shall have to come to a more effectively disciplined and a more orderly traffic stream. There will be less opportunities for great variances in driving speeds because of fewer times when one can overtake and pass in the heavier traffic stream. Traffic restrictions will certainly become more extensive and rigorous with more left turns eliminated, more one-way operation, more marking of lanes and insistence upon adherence to lanes in driving, more and more elimination of curb parking, increased applications of various combinations of methods to expedite major traffic flows.

In like manner, there simply must be greatly improved roadside protection. We shall have to give due recognition to the necessity of securing adequate rights-of-way. Controlled access must be utilized much more extensively on the most important arteries—this being the one and only certain method of assuring that the full capacity and effectiveness of the artery will be retained for traffic movement. Highway zoning will have to be very much more extensively utilized so that its benefits in improving the efficiency of traffic movement and reducing hazards will be achieved.

These are some of the roadside protection measures set forth in the booklet "Roadside Protection—A Study of the Problem and Suggested

Approaches to Betterment," which our Association has published and the ideas of which the Association is promoting.

Hastening Improvement Measures: Our job—the job of our Association and of you people—seems to me clearly to be that of taking such constructive steps as we can to hasten these actions—and for the moment, I am going to limit the discussion to those relating to roadside protection.

The task won't be easy! Bringing about these improvement measures which from the long-range viewpoint are, I think, inevitable, will not be easy. It isn't easy to change the thinking and customs of people. Our legislative bodies are conservative in acting on various new ideas. The public must be thoroughly informed on such matters and that takes time. But most of all, perhaps, we must face the fact that forces, with lots of ready money in some cases, are ever alert to prevent such constructive actions.

Let me cite to you a good example from nearby Maryland.

What Happened to Maryland House of Delegates Bill No. 10: On January 5, 1955, there was introduced in the House of Delegates of Maryland, a Bill for roadside protection authorizing the State Roads Commission to designate highways and parts of highways, outside the corporate limits of any town or city, as "Roadside Protected Highways," authorizing the Commission to establish protective areas adjacent to such highways, to control and regulate uses of land and business and commercial structures within such protective areas, to issue permits in accordance with such control and regulation, providing for hearings by the Commission and appeals therefrom, and relating generally to the development and protection of roadsides in Maryland.

This Bill authorized the Highway Commission, with the consent of the County Commissioner of the county concerned, to institute a roadside zoning program. Would that program have prohibited uses of commercial developments, including billboards? Not at all. It would have established some districts in which these uses would have been prohibited and other districts in which they would have been expressly permitted.

Would it have provided for going an excessive distance to the sides and beyond the highway right-of-way? Far from it. As a matter of fact, while recommended distances for control bordering highways are up to 1,000 feet on each side, when a roadside protection bill was presented to the 1953 General Assembly that distance had been squeezed down to 200 feet. The 1955 Bill, as presented to the Legislative Council, called for such a 200 foot control. But by the time the Bill was printed, that figure had shrunk to 75 feet.

Let me refer now to some comments regarding this Bill by Irving C. Root, City Planner. I quote the following from a strong statement which Mr. Root prepared, dated February 15, 1955.

The average citizen, recognizing the solid benefits to accrue from this proposed legislation, would logically expect it to pass promptly and without question. But he would not be aware of the small, powerful and wealthy organization that has been highly successful in stalling desirable public legislation in every state of our country. . . .

I was disturbed by an article I saw last Friday in a Washington paper which said the outdoor advertising interests had a lobby in Annapolis for the purpose of killing this bill. The article went on to say the lobby handed out a printed statement saying, among other things, that the bill if passed would set up a "Czar" in the State Roads Commission office who presumably would dictate unreasonably. Of course, there would be no dictator set up by the State Roads Commission who would administer unreasonably. However, that is a sample of the misleading inference that the billboard people spread around hoping to confuse the gullible.

Mr. Root then points out that no highway zoning regulation would be applied without concurrence of county elected officials. Hundreds of miles of state highways are already zoned by counties and so would not be touched by this bill.

Mr. Root then refers to the cutting down to 75 feet of the distance to the sides from the highway right-of-way to which the regulations would apply. He makes this statement:

One is inclined to wonder why the billboard industry is against this bill after they have practically written it themselves to suit their own purpose. The reason is that the industry prefers no controls at all. They want the liberty to put any number of billboards on your favorite highway advertising everything made from Kalamazoo to Timbucktoo. And right now they can do that very thing excepting in our growing number of Maryland zoned towns and counties.

The wealthy billboard boys have so consistently had their way with the Maryland Legislature that the electorate, who are interested in this bill, will want to know,—is it a sellout or a give-away?

He then refers to some court decisions from other States relating to billboards.

One of Mr. Root's concluding statements is as follows:

It is interesting to note that the leading outdoor advertising company has had such a profitable year that its stock increased fifty percent in value. Thus outdoor advertising could hardly be considered as a depressed industry that deserved special favors at the expense of Maryland taxpayers.

The measure was defeated as not offering "a satisfactory solution which was deemed to be in the best interests of the citizens of the State of Maryland." However, in lieu of this legislation, the House of Delegates has called on the State Planning Commission to prepare and submit to the General Assembly, in time for its consideration at the 1957 session, proposed plans including regulations to be used as a basis by the General Assembly in adopting plans and regulations essential to promote orderly and coordinated development of lands along or adjacent to state highways and parkways.

Now, let's look at a much more recent occurrence.

A short time ago, Senator Neuberger according to page 5788 of the Congressional Record of May 23, 1955, indicated that he had introduced an amendment in an important highway bill. This bill is a revised version of *S. 1048*, popularly known as the Gore Bill, for Federal aid highway improvements with special emphasis on the National System of Interstate Highways.

Senator Neuberger's amendment, and I quote him, "had only one purpose, namely, that in the case of the Interstate System, in which the American people are going to invest and are investing billions of dollars to construct, it should not be possible to plaster it with all kinds of advertising material, which would have no value whatsoever unless the American people had invested billions of dollars in the road system."

In case some of you are not familiar with the term, the so-called Inter-state System is the National System of Interstate Highways of 40,000 miles maximum length which, constituting only slightly over one percent of the road mileage of this country, will carry in its rural segments one-fifth of the traffic. It is the very backbone of our highway system and is the system which the Department of Defense has recognized as having top importance from a point of view of defense. It is likewise our most important system from the point of view of general economy.

Let me quote what the Bill would have provided. The first part of Section 4 (a) reads as follows:

In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding five hundred feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States.

The section goes on to require that it be determined that the State is unable to acquire these lands, or interests in lands with sufficient promptness, and that the State has agreed to pay 10 percent of the costs. It is provided that the costs shall be paid from funds which would otherwise go to that State for improvement of its part of the Interstate System.

Then the Secretary is authorized and directed to convey such lands or interests in lands, except the outside five feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the state highway department, under terms to be agreed upon by the Secretary of Commerce and the state highway department, or political subdivisions

involved. "Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside five feet may be conveyed to it."

You see, then, that in the first place this proposal becomes effective only if the State requests it. It involves acquiring lands or interests in lands to permit control of access and also "*the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding five hundred feet from the right-of-way.*"

One of the most distinguished members of the United States Senate took issue with this provision for the Federal Government to acquire temporarily, on behalf of the state, the exclusive right to advertise on lands within five hundred feet of the right-of-way. The discussion which was very animated turned on the question of whether this constituted a negative easement (whatever that is) and on whether such a negative easement could be conveyed by the Federal Government back to the states.

Now, the language would seem to involve purchasing *the exclusive right to advertise*, which does not sound like a negative proposal at all. Nonetheless, the argument seemed to turn on that point and on the perhaps even more fundamental question of the Federal Government having any such rights whatsoever instead of leaving it all up to the states—in which realm the distinguished Senator indicated he had no objection to exercise of controls.

Now, I do not know what all the various elements were which entered this picture, but I do know the provision was defeated.

Furthermore, I know what one of our AAA Affiliated Clubs got from a representative of the General Outdoor Advertising Company and I should like to read you a quotation from a letter which they wrote us.

"We have been asked by a local representative of General Outdoor Advertising Company to use our influence to kill an amendment to the Gore Bill S. 1048 under which the government may take possession of land within 500 feet of Federal aid highways.

"Our friend in General Outdoor is of the opinion of course that this is discriminatory insofar as Outdoor Advertising is concerned."

Now note the inaccuracies in the assertions made:

There was no proposal whatever for the Federal Government to take possession of land within five hundred feet of Federal aid highways. Indeed, the very much less broad proposal related only to the Interstate System, which is a very small segment, albeit a very important segment, of the total Federal aid mileage.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have cited these two cases to you because they show very clearly, it seems to me, at least one kind of opposition which must be anticipated.

Major Congressional Bills, Including Provision for Control of Access.

But I have gotten a little bit ahead of my main story. You all know,

I am sure, that President Eisenhower became so impressed with the seriousness of the highway deficiency that he addressed the Governors at Bolton Landing, New York, last year about the problem and urged their cooperation in developing a plan to meet the situation. Out of this proposal and the work of the Governor's Conference and of a committee under General Lucius Clay, appointed by the President, there has been developed a challenging proposal for a multi-billion dollar program, the major purpose of which is to complete the construction of the National System of Interstate Highways within the next 10 years at suitable standards.

This proposal has been formulated in Senate Bill *S. 1160*, and in House Bill *H. R. 4260* and some other identical bills.

As a result of extensive hearings in the Roads Subcommittee of the Senate, a modified Bill, popularly known as the *Gore Bill*, *S. 1048*, has been introduced. It would provide for a different method of financing and for increased emphasis on other Federal aid highways at the same time as the Interstate Highway is being improved.

The point I wish to make emphatically is that both of these major bills contain provisions whereby for the interstate system the control of access can be assured provided, of course, a State wishes that to be done, even if the State does not now have the necessary laws for accomplishing that purpose.

In both Bills, the idea involved is for the Federal Government, on request of the State, to purchase lands and interests in lands, which would later be conveyed back to the State, except the outside five feet of the right-of-way which would not be conveyed back until the State had adopted suitable laws for the control of access, at which time the remaining five foot strips would also be conveyed back to the States.

Friends, this is an extremely important progressive measure and I beg of you that you ask your Congressmen to give it their support. The numbers of the key bills again are *S. 1160*, *S. 1048* and *H. R. 4260*.

Control of Access to be Acquired Where Needed: The concept in the Clay Report and in these major bills is for the acquiring of the control of access *where needed or required* by the State. To my way of thinking, it is most unfortunate that they didn't go all the way and provide for acquisition of control of access throughout the Interstate System. The reason is simple. The plan admits the need to obtain it where it is needed. The Clay Report reminds us that where it is not now needed, it may be needed later. And experience has repeatedly shown that where it is not now needed and even where it does not seem that it will be needed, *it will cost very little to obtain it at this time.*

So much for roadside protection in relation to the major Federal road legislation. Before concluding, may I make quick reference to two other encouraging developments?

Advance Acquisition of Right-of-Way: One of the very encouraging developments has been that of California in the advance acquisition of rights-of-way. Impressed with the fact that failure to acquire rights-of-way in advance often resulted in tremendous increases in right-of-way costs, California decided to try out the idea of a revolving fund earmarked for the acquisition of rights-of-way. Originally \$10 million in 1952, the fund was increased in 1953 to a total of \$30 million.

California officials assert on the basis of documented investigations that for every dollar invested today in future highway right-of-way, savings ranging from ten to thirty dollars will accrue during the next twelve years. This means that in terms of the entire present authorizations, savings will be made ranging from \$300 million to \$900 million. Perhaps in no other segment of highway development are such fantastic dividends possible.

Let me illustrate by contrast between two sections of the same freeway—the Sepulveda Freeway. In 1948, a section of the right-of-way was purchased for the future Sepulveda Freeway for a little over \$100,000. It was purchased at that time to protect it from the very kind of apartment development that has taken place in the area in the last six years. Had the California Division of Highways delayed the acquisition of this right-of-way to the present time and the property been permitted to develop in a manner similar to the rest of the area (which would have been inevitable), it is estimated that it would have cost the Division in excess of \$2,200,000 to acquire the right-of-way involved—or approximately 22 times as much.

In contrast, consider another section of the same Freeway between Washington and Jefferson Boulevards. Ten years ago this section, only five percent developed, contained improvements worth approximately \$35,000. Today, the section is 100 percent developed and contains improvements valued in excess of \$1,750,000, exclusive of land cost. This greatly increased right-of-way cost currently will face the California Division of Highways when it proceeds with acquisition of right-of-way on this project.

Here is a method of dealing with a very important problem directly related to roadside protection which seems destined to receive favorable consideration in other states. Already it is understood that something similar is being used elsewhere. It is an idea worth promoting!

Anti-Litter Campaign: May I also make a quick reference to an anti-litter campaign? You know what bad litterbugs we Americans are. It is something we certainly should not be proud of. It is something that we should certainly seek to bring under control. Here is a method conceived, as I understand it, by one of you fine folk. It consists of providing a waxed, water-proof litterbag for use in an automobile. Here's a sample. In it one would place waste paper, banana peels, tin

cans, gum wrappings, etc., and then these would be emptied into a suitable roadside trash container.

It will interest you, I believe, to know that it is expected that this summer approximately one million of these bags will be distributed. We are very pleased that a considerable number of affiliated AAA Clubs are becoming active in this campaign.

What Can You and I Do? May I conclude by dealing for a moment with what you and I can do? We have a challenging need. I have already urged and I again urge you to write your Congressmen regarding retention of the control of access feature regarding pending legislation (S. 1160, S. 1048, H. R. 4260). We must do an even better job of informing and educating the public on the importance of this matter—and we must utilize various methods of accomplishing this.

I have already mentioned the AAA booklet, "Roadside Protection." I might also draw to your attention a reprint of a magazine article by our Executive Vice-President, Russell E. Singer, "How to Gilt-Edge Our Highway Investment," which has been put into a folder for wide distribution, entitled "Protecting the Highway Investment Through Roadside Zoning." Copies of this are available here for those of you who are interested.

We are now developing some educational material on this general subject directed specifically to the layman. We are giving much attention to use of the picture-cartoon as the main means of putting the story across.

We are promoting an idea of getting the main road designers of the highway departments to hold a sort of seminar-observation discussion in which they would discuss some of these recent developments and new ideas and we would hope, examine very carefully the superb features of the relatively short section of U. S. 240, not too far north of Washington, in the vicinity of Frederick, and also the Garden State Parkway. Both of these freeways have utilized unique concepts of design which mean much more pleasant and efficient highways, and I think it is reasonable to predict much safer ones. They follow the topography of the land, with easy curves, varying distances between two one-way separated roads, etc.

May I also urge consideration of the much greater use of roadside surveys? These have been carried on in Minnesota and Michigan. Funds are available from Federal aid. The cooperation of the Bureau of Public Roads is, I believe, available, is it not, Dr. Levin? These surveys can form an excellent basis for determining what the roadside conditions really are and for deciding upon a constructive improvement program. They constitute an idea which deserves far greater promotion than it has had heretofore.

In closing, may I pay high tribute to you people? Winston Churchill was the man who used the expression about so many owing so much

to so few. This seems most appropriate as it applies to you folk. I am repeatedly astonished at what so few dedicated persons can accomplish in getting results—even against most serious obstacles and odds—for constructive measures which are right.

You deserve the hearty commendation of the people of America. May you continue your good and effective work.

Discussion

THOMAS W. MORSE, Superintendent of State Parks,
Department of Conservation and Development, Raleigh, N. C.

IN DISCUSSING state *parks and highways*, the speakers on this panel have pointed out that state parks and highways are both very important and essential components of the overall pattern of parks and open spaces.

Highways, properly constructed and maintained with adequate attention to the roadside, are actually open spaces, although we may not ordinarily think of them as such. This is particularly true of parkways, throughways and similar types of highways.

Statistics show that a very large percentage of highway travel is recreational travel. This fact should be much more widely accepted by highway planners and should be reflected in highway planning much more than it is. Today, of course, highway planners take the recreational use of highways more into account than they formerly did—the growing number of roadside parks, roadside rests, overlooks and so forth are evidence of this—but the conception of highways as true open spaces and recreational facilities has still to be realized. The readiness, even eagerness, with which highway planners would route highways through existing parks of all kinds vividly illustrates that this conception is still far from realization.

As the two panel members who spoke on state parks, both of whom are Directors of large state park systems, pointed out, state parks are highly important units of the overall scheme of parks and open spaces. The purposes of state park systems are:

- (1) to protect and preserve natural areas of unique or exceptional scenic value for the inspiration, benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations;

- (2) to provide for public use areas that provide recreational use of natural resources and outdoor recreation in natural surroundings;

- (3) to portray and interpret plant and animal life, geology and other natural features in state parks; and

- (4) to preserve, protect and portray historic and scientific sites of state-wide importance. Not all state park systems however, include

historic sites since, in some States, these sites are administered by other agencies.

State park systems supplement and complement both national parks and local parks and recreational facilities.

State park systems have been subjected to the pressure of heavy public use arising from increased standards of living, increased use of the automobile and increased leisure time. This pressure has brought about many of the problems that confront the national parks and each state must, therefore, undertake studies and prepare plans similar to those being made for the national parks and outlined to us last evening by the Director of the National Park Service.

There needs to be more uniformity in state park standards and principles. All states should adopt and follow principles and standards similar to the "Suggested Criteria for Evaluating Areas Proposed for Inclusion in the State Park Systems" adopted by the National Conference on State Parks. Some States have such a written set of principles and standards; other do not.

State Parks are vital to the overall pattern of parks and open spaces and have done much to enrich the lives of the millions who use and enjoy them annually. Great as have been the past benefits of state parks, the benefits they can render in the future are far greater.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as enacted by the 84th Congress and approved June 29, 1956, provides that the Secretary of Commerce, if requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands, including control of access from adjoining lands, may proceed under certain conditions.

IN THE CITIES AND TOWNS

EDITOR'S NOTE:— Papers presented at the National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

What Parks and Open Spaces Mean to the American People

JOSEPH PRENDERGAST, Executive Director, National Recreation Association,
New York, N. Y.

PARKS and open spaces mean a great deal to the American people, perhaps more than to any other people in the world, because parks in the modern sense of the word and open spaces in both the modern and the traditional sense have contributed and can continue to contribute much to the very essence of the American way of life.

The physical wealth, the emotional strength, and the great democratic spirit characteristic of America have been shaped and formed under the pressure of an abundance of open space. First, it was an unknown and empty continent which faced the restless, adventuresome men who explored the coast of the New World. As more and more sailing ships brought colonists fleeing from the crowded areas of Europe, the wide Appalachian Mountains were crossed and the heart of the continent penetrated by men and women seeking freedom and opportunity.

Every child in America knows about Davey Crockett and that amazing group of frontiersmen who until the late 19th century were continually on the move for new "open space"—virgin land on which to hunt, search for wealth, and finally to settle and raise families.

B. A. Botkin in his *Treasury of American Folklore* describes these people in this way:

"In endless brags and gags, tall talk and tall tales, heroic myths and sagas, blues and ballads, they express the boundless optimism and the 'individual competitive aggressiveness' of a restless, ingenious, wisecracking folk with one foot in the road, who still believe in miracles and in greener fields across the next river or mountain, in the next county or state."

It is worth noting that the inscription on the California State Capitol reads, "Bring me men to match my mountains." And of Davey Crockett's description of the frontiersmen of his time: "There are some first-rate men there, of the real half-horse, half-alligator breed, with a sprinkling of the steamboat, and such as grow nowhere on the face of the universal earth, but just about the backbone of North America."

The folklore, the tradition and the fact of the American wilderness, frontier and open space have had an enormous influence on the American character. Although the frontier had disappeared by the 1890's

the spirit of democracy and individual initiative literally forced upon the American people by boundless open space continued to flourish. American business, government, industry, and education received their greatest stimulation from the concept of America as the land of opportunity. And the land of opportunity basically meant an endless stretch of open space where a man could achieve success and happiness.

With the closing of the frontier certain American civic leaders more sensitive, perhaps, than others to the special American need for open spaces began to unite and speak of the individual and social evil of crowding too many people in too small areas in cities, without making provision for the people to keep in frequent contact with the elements of a natural environment. They advocated the preservation of large areas within cities to serve as retreats for the people, for rest in an environment of peace, quietness and natural beauty, and for such forms of active recreation as would not destroy the essential quality of the areas as places of inspiration and enjoyment of the beauties of nature.

The first concrete result of this movement was Central Park in New York City (1853) followed in rapid succession by the establishment of similar parks in several other large cities of the United States. From these beginnings during the last half of the 19th century have evolved the elaborate systems of recreational areas providing for both active and passive recreation in our cities of today. In 1885, the first playground was established in Boston and in 1906 with the founding of the Playground Association of America, now the National Recreation Association, the national recreation movement was well under way.

In 1892-93, the Boston Metropolitan Park System was established as a special method of handling on a district basis the acquisition, development and administration of recreation areas which it was not practicable for local, town and city governments in the region to handle alone. The metropolitan district plan has, of course, since spread to other sections of the country.

In 1895, the first county park system was established in Essex County, New Jersey. The principal county recreation developments since then have been in counties in the metropolitan regions of large cities serving practically the same functions as metropolitan park districts, although in a few counties the recreational service provided is primarily for rural and small rural-urban communities. In some parts of the country townships and special districts have also been used to administer recreation systems.

Between 1870 and 1880, a few States such as California, New York, Michigan and Minnesota began to establish state parks and recreational areas—a movement which has since spread to every State in the Union with Colorado the last State to do so establishing a state park agency in 1955. The establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872 marked the entrance of the Federal Government into the field of con-

servation of natural resources for recreation, from which has grown the magnificent system of national recreational areas now available to us all.

I do not know whether or not there was any conscious plan on the part of the American people or their leaders to substitute local, state and national parks and other open spaces for the frontiers and boundless open spaces of the past so that the best values of frontier and pioneer life could be perpetuated. Perhaps they were seeking simply to assure some opportunities for happier and more abundant lives through active outdoor recreation or passive enjoyment of nature without really knowing why the American people had a special need for parks and open spaces.

It is fortunate, indeed, that the early 20th century pioneers in conservation, park and recreation planning were so successful. Thanks to their farsightedness we have made a good start in the acquisition of an adequate network of national, state and local parks and recreation areas. In the transition period between the age of the frontier, the industrial revolution, and a new age of leisure, they have provided the American people with a down payment on the kind of land dedicated to the public use which we are going to need to live successfully in this new age of leisure.

Perhaps I should add here that I am using the word "recreation" as it was used in the 1934 report of the National Park Service for the Land Planning Committee of the National Resources Board to connote "all that is recreative of the individual, the community or the nation. In this sense, it is broader than the 'physical activity' concept. It includes mental and spiritual expression. It allows gratification of the nearly infinite variety of tastes and predilections so far as that gratification is consistent with sustained utilization of the nation's recreational resources."

I think all of us here today would agree with the views expressed in that 1934 report that "the public recreation movement in America represents a conscious cultural ideal of the American people, just as the great system of public education represented such an ideal. It takes rank with the system of public education as a necessary addition to the cultural equipment of the nation. Its supreme objective is the promotion of the general welfare through the creation of opportunities for a more abundant and happier life for everyone."

The wilderness is gone. The frontier is passed. The age of leisure is here. The impact of advertising through every possible media proclaims that this is so. We are constantly being besieged to buy products which will help us enjoy our leisure the more. And incidentally, may I note in passing, that a great many of these products are ones which are consumed or used en route or at our public parks and recreation areas. Or they are products which we need special recreation skills to enjoy.

The 1950 census reports gave the first really substantial statistical information indicating that leisure is now possible for everyone and not just for the favored few. Since then, business publications, reports and magazines have assembled an amazing collection of facts which demonstrate conclusively that recreation and leisure are now of major importance to American living and that in the years ahead leisure and how it is used will be a major concern of every business and industry, civic organization, school, church and unit of government.

POPULATION GROWTH

Consider briefly these facts. During the hundred years of the 19th century, our population only increased from 5 million to 76 million. By 1925, however, it was 114 million and by 1954, 163 million and it is increasing at an even faster rate.

Last year there were over 4 million births, the highest on record and the eighth straight year over $3\frac{1}{2}$ million. Last year we had the highest net increase in the population in any one year—over 2,600,000.

No longer are we surprised to hear that the Bureau of the Census forecasts a population of 177 million in 1960 and 221 million in 1975—a rise of some 35 percent in the next twenty years.

LEISURE TIME

This tremendous growth in population is being accompanied by an even more fabulous growth in the non-working time—the leisure hours, the recreation time—of the American people. This is true for children and youth, for working men and women, for women who are not employed outside their homes, and for older adults.

In 1800, the average workweek in industrial establishments consisted of 84 hours; in 1900, 60 hours; in 1925, 50 hours and in 1950, 40 hours. And within the past two years the four-day workweek with its 30 to 32 hours of work has come to be discussed as if it would be generally adopted within the next decade or two.

Ten years ago the very word “automation” had not even been invented. Five years, three years ago, electronic devices were just being played with. Now they are beginning to have a tremendous effect on our national economy and our individual lives. I wish I had time to tell you about how automation is already being used by some industries, and what some of the forecasts are for the future, especially as regards the increased amount of leisure time for all the people of America. But let me summarize what this country will face when automation is fully adopted by asking the question John Diebold, editor of *Automatic Control* raises. “Are we capable,” he asks “of developing a culture that does not depend upon work to give meaning to our lives?”

HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING

An enormous increase in population and a tremendous expansion in nonworking time are being accompanied by a rapidly rising national economy and a constantly higher living standard.

The United States Department of Commerce in July, 1954 reported that the 1953 national product reached a new peak of one billion dollars a day or \$365 billion in goods and services a year. Today it is running at the annual rate of \$370 billion. Total production in 1950, 1951, 1952 and 1953 set successive new records over the previous high achieved at the peak of wartime production in 1944 when it reached \$268 billion.

The Committee for Economic Development, a private research organization, has predicted that by 1965, gross national product will total \$535 billion, an increase of 50 percent over present rates. Output per manhour as estimated by the Federal Reserve has been steadily increasing at an annual rate of 2 percent or more since 1947. There is no sign that American industry, especially in the coming age of automation, cannot, at least, maintain that performance.

What does this mean in terms of the families of America? It means simply this—in 1944, the average family had an income of \$3,610 as compared to \$4,460 in 1950. In 1953, the average family income was well in excess of \$5,000. In 1929, only 31 percent of all American families had incomes between \$3,000 and \$10,000 a year while in 1953, 58 percent of all families had such incomes measured in dollars of like purchasing power.

One million families, according to a book just issued by the editors of *Fortune* magazine under the title "The Changing American Market," are crossing the \$4,000 income figure a year and in five years a like number will be crossing the \$5,000 income line.

Business Week Magazine more than a year ago said, "spending money on leisure is no longer considered an economic waste. In fact, the future economy of America will be built upon leisure-time spending. There is just so much food and clothing and shelter and other things needed for bare existence. There is no foreseeable limit to what we need and can use as our leisure time increases."

There can be no doubt that one of the major trends in living today is leisure. It is a fact. How we are prepared to use it and what we do with it will to a great extent determine the kind of people and the kind of nation we will be in the years ahead.

I wish I could confidently say that the future American character will be moulded in as desirable a way by the fact of leisure as it was by the fact of wilderness and the frontier. I wish I could say open spaces were available now to help the growth of the American character in the same tradition as in pioneer America. We have time, money, and people for leisure. But we have not yet developed an ethics of leisure, sufficient leaders for leisure, and above all, adequate spaces to enjoy leisure activities.

Open space for leisure living is essential for the continued growth of the kind of American character we cherish. Without places to play, a philosophy of recreation, an ethics of leisure, will be of little value.

The age of leisure will become a stunted and meaningless thing. Unless an informed public aggressively insists on its right to adequate park and other recreation areas, the vanishing wilderness and the vanishing frontier will be joined by a vanishing opportunity for outdoor recreation.

How critical is the need for additional parks and open spaces? Let me refer to an estimate of the National Resources Planning Board in 1942 that 4 million additional acres of state park land should be acquired to meet the needs of the expanding population. By comparison, between 1939 and 1952 only 500,000 acres were actually acquired.

Consider, for example, the latest *Twentieth Century Fund* report on "America's Needs and Resources." They report that in 1950 an additional 276,000 acres of park land were needed by urban residents to bring their cities up to the basic standard. Very few of these needed acres have been acquired.

At the national level attendance at national parks and recreation areas has increased enormously. For example, in 1916 when the National Park Service was created by law, only 358,000 people visited the areas under its supervision. Last year the attendance was 48 million. Visitors to the Corps of Engineer projects increased from 10 million in 1949 to 26 million in 1951 and 53,848,000 in 1954. Similar amazing figures could be cited for all the other recreation areas of various kinds under the administration of Federal agencies.

According to Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, it will require two and a half times the present appropriation over a ten-year period to correct the present bad campground conditions and double the present facilities.

The problem of open space, its development and maintenance at the national level, have received much national publicity in the past few years. It will need much more before the average American will insist on better provisions for his leisure in the national parks, forests and other recreation areas under Federal jurisdiction.

But what is happening at the local level receives only local publicity. So far, there has been little national publicity given to the critical need for new park areas and open spaces in cities and towns and suburban areas. And yet in city after city, and suburb after suburb, the competition for the use of the remaining open space is becoming tremendous.

Existing park land is being sought for fire stations, super-highways, juvenile detention homes, public housing and other public purposes as well as for private use. At the same time, new neighborhoods are being built over night by developers and subdividers. A recent article in the *New York Herald Tribune* reports:

"All this points up what community planners in all the suburban areas are emphasizing as the basic need—land acquisition for future growth. They are in agreement that the localities themselves—the counties, cities, towns and villages—must act soon to acquire the land sites for playgrounds which may not

be needed for years to come. Development is moving so fast that available recreational sites are vanishing overnight."

Professional park and recreation people, representatives of citizens boards and committees must help alert the American people to the very serious need for the protection of existing parks, water resources, conservation areas, and other recreation sites, and for the expansion of these areas to meet the new need of a leisure age. Informed professionals and civic leaders need to be joined by business and industry in a massive campaign to assure adequate parks and open spaces for the future. The stake of private enterprise in the new leisure is great.

The Disappearing Countryside in Metropolitan Areas

C. McKIM NORTON, Vice-President, Regional Plan Association, New York, N. Y.

IN THIS brief address I hope to establish just two points for your consideration as citizens concerned with parks and open spaces.

First, that our metropolitan urban areas in which more than half of the Nation's people now live are expanding very rapidly, devouring natural countryside that we have taken for granted would somehow always be available "once one got out of town."

Second, that the new kind of automobile age city which we are building with an almost frenzied rapidity, requires a new concept of parks and open space reservations as bold and imaginative as the original city park movement of a hundred years ago.

Let me illustrate my first point from the development facts of our New York metropolitan region which includes parts of northern New Jersey, southern New York State, Connecticut's Fairfield County and Long Island.

In the first 300 years of this metropolitan area's development (from 1626 to 1925) some 420 square miles of land were covered with residential development of an urban character. In the last 30 years 580 additional square miles of urban housing were required. If present trends continue, the next 20 years will see 600 more square miles of today's open land in our region required to house the 4 million people the Regional Plan Association estimates will be added to our New York metropolitan population by 1975.

In terms of population, the first 9 million people were housed in 420 square miles; the next 6 million required 580 square miles; the predicted 4 million more by 1975 will use up 600 additional square miles.

It takes about 3 times as much land to house people in metropolitan cities today as it took our ancestors.

If one adds the land which will be required for all the other uses besides housing—school sites, factory sites, shopping centers, expressways and the host of other uses of land—by 1970 we can predict a con-

tinuous carpet of urban development stretching 70 miles east-west and 40 miles north of New York's City Hall.

Our southern sector may be expected to remain open. It's the Atlantic Ocean.

The huge central part of our metropolitan area—some 2800 square miles—was land rich a few years ago. It is becoming land poor with amazing rapidity. One of our developers alone builds homes at the rate of two square miles a year.

The nature of this urban growth is known to you all. The tight packed central city of 1900 has simply exploded into what used to be called its suburbs. As the flow of asphalt and front lawns erupts into the countryside, the first sign of things to come is the neo-suburbanite with his station wagon and his willingness to spend up to an hour twice daily in his journey to work. He settles on scattered acreage lots with plenty of spaces between houses. Very soon, however, the empty acre next door has a house on it. A shopping center and a factory appear in the vicinity encouraged by a new expressway. With local employment, some of which may be in the next town, comes the demand for smaller lots. The short cycle from suburbanization to urbanization is complete.

As city planners, we have seen many improvements in urban design standards. The garden apartment built to standards of useable open space is better than its six-story predecessor. Lot sizes are now larger. There is progress in small parks and playgrounds. Subdivision layouts are better. Factories are now set in park-like surroundings. Parkways take us pleasantly through densely built-up areas. These are all gains but they must not hide our principal loss—the open countryside, the relatively undeveloped open spaces—the land used for nothing except enjoyment of jack rabbits and human beings outdoors in natural surroundings—as they say in New England, the land which, thank God, separates your town from my town.

Farming, of course, yields readily to urban development. Topography and swampland which once served as barriers to development today succumb to the bulldozer, the split level house, the municipal dump and new techniques of land fill for factories.

Once one could walk or bicycle out of town on a Sunday afternoon. Today one can motor into the country on a Sunday (if you don't mind the fight to get back Sunday night). Tomorrow one may predict a trip to the countryside will be an overnight expedition.

In presenting my first point I have not exaggerated the picture. The figures and your own observations add up to the same story. As the New York region has grown, it has spread itself all over the landscape. And the same thing is happening to cities right across the country.

One feature of the new metropolitan city is that it is so deceptively open in character. It looks as though it should end any minute and give way to real country. But it never does.

The 1951 Edition of the New York *Walk Book* summarizes the situation when it states, "A comparison of the walks described in the first (1923) edition of this *Walk Book* with those available to the general public at the time this present edition is being written, indicates only too clearly how rapidly private land is being built up or closed. It looks as though it will be only a few years before the trampster will be largely confined to national, state and county parks, reservations and forests for his recreation." This is the difference between 1923 and 1951.

I am convinced that this overwhelming blanket of urbanization cannot be relieved by any other means known to us today short of public acquisition of land as park and open space reservation.

Zoning and subdivision control, between them, may slow down the rate of close development, and may improve the quality of ultimate development, but the police power is simply not a constitutional means of reserving large areas of open space for public use.

Since 1925 about 35,000 acres of large park lands have been publicly acquired in our metropolitan area. This sounds like a lot until you realize that it is not much more land than has been used in the same period for rights of way for the arterial highway system—for expressways, parkways, major highway widening and clover leaf intersections. Furthermore, 20 percent of this new large park acreage is located within New York City, thanks to the energy and foresight of Robert Moses. Much of the balance is concentrated in the mountainous northwest sector of the region, instead of where we need it most in the rapidly growing flatlands.

A hundred years ago against almost insuperable odds and at great cost, our predecessors "brought the country into the city"—New York's central park, for example. How can our generation rise to the new task of preventing the city from overrunning the countryside with block upon block of continuous urban development?

Where we thought of central city parks in hard won acres, must we not aim for outer area land reservations in terms of square miles? Should we not make metropolitan plans to acquire many mountain areas, undeveloped water courses, large swamps and, where necessary, ribbons or squares of flat lands so as to keep some of the metropolitan countryside out of the clutches of the expanding city?

Our plans must be scaled to the automobile era. Fifteen minutes travel time equals 10 miles. Within 10 miles of everyone in our great cities there should be a public land reservation large enough to let people escape from the automobile, the bulldozer and the no trespassing sign.

Our plans must be made and executed soon or else the metropolitan countryside of which I speak will be lost forever. One can redevelop a slum, but one cannot recreate natural countryside once development has passed over it.

To carry out metropolitan land reservation plans will require county, state and even federal action. Private action such as the Nature Conservancy is invaluable. Few municipalities in metropolitan fringe areas, however, have either the understanding, the will or the financial ability to act before great opportunities are lost. Until the urban people come, the country people cannot be expected to anticipate urban needs and requirements. If nothing is done before the non-farming population arrives, it is already too late to act. The prime mover in acquiring metropolitan land reservations must, I believe, be the States themselves or metropolitan park districts created by the States.

Two recent suggestions have been made for new techniques of achieving and maintaining land reservations.

One is to combine the principles of land option and installment buying to the park acquisition problem.

Another suggestion is to reward low intensity uses with a tax differential.

Whether new methods are evolved, or time-tested park acquisition by purchase or condemnation is used, the object in view is simple and urgent. A new park and land reservation movement to reserve a reasonable amount of suitably located countryside in our growing suburban areas is one of the most important and urgent problems facing the nation's metropolitan areas.

Our Federal City Parks

GILMORE D. CLARKE, New York City

WASHINGTON is unique among the important cities of the world; it has grown, more or less consistently, about a basic pattern of streets and parks conceived at the beginning of its existence. The site for the Nation's Capital was selected by President Washington and he wisely provided for the preparation of a plan for its development. The plan of 1791, prepared by Charles Pierre L'Enfant, was conceived with a view toward arranging the important elements in a manner to provide beauty, dignity, and convenience in a city destined to become the capital of a new country in "the new world." The fact that the same broad basic conception persists to this day is testimony to the wisdom and the foresight of its makers.

The plan of 1791 has been revised from time to time as the population of the City has increased and as new means of transportation have been developed. In 1901 the Senate Park Commission made a careful study of the L'Enfant plan and adjusted it to the demands of the City of that day and, insofar as possible, to the anticipated growth and development. This plan, as it was applied to the central area of the City, was based upon the fundamental precepts laid down by L'Enfant.

In 1910 President Taft appointed seven men, "well qualified judges of the Fine Arts," to serve as members of the newly authorized Commission of Fine Arts. This body, without power of veto over the acts of legislative authority, alone preserved the integrity of the plan of Washington until 1926, when President Coolidge, by authority of the Congress, appointed the members of an official planning body, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. They have guided the program for the development of the District of Columbia in co-operation with other agencies including the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the office of National Capital Parks of the National Park Service (since 1933), and the Commission of Fine Arts. These agencies of the Government have cooperated for more than a quarter of a century in the development of plans for the Capital City. When authority has overlapped, as has obtained frequently, these agencies have arranged to have their representatives meet together so that conflicting views might be presented, discussed and, whenever possible, resolved. The plans of each agency are subject to review and comment by the other agencies with the view toward preserving the best interests of the people of the Nation.

Uppermost in the minds of those charged with the planning of Washington should be the fact that this, the Capital City of the Nation, belongs to the people of the whole Nation and that it is visited by people from all of the States and from every country in the world. Only the broadest views should be taken with respect to the planning of new elements in the City Plan; nothing should be done that would tend to destroy values created over the period of more than 150 years since the City was born; and nothing should be done unless it is thoroughly reviewed and endorsed by every interested agency so as to insure the preservation of those values that have given distinction to the Capital of the United States.

We cannot retain a distinguished city if we continue to make errors of expediency which usually prove to be costly and of which some probably never can be corrected. We must guard against the immediate satisfaction of what may seem to be exigencies at the moment because the results may develop into follies as viewed ten years or more from now. We must keep uppermost in our minds the fact that we are planning for the growth of a city. Changes will be inevitable as the social, economic, and political factors change, but the changes should be planned and guided by wise men with broad vision to the end that we may leave for the generations to come a city better than we found it.

It is essential that any changes made in the plan of the City be made with due regard for the value of the natural beauty that still exists, as well as of the beauty created by the hand of man. All so-called improvements, whether they be to facilitate the movement of automotive traffic, to correct past shortsighted housing developments,

to improve public utilities, or to provide new space for public buildings, should be planned in a manner to preserve the irreplaceable values in the form of natural endowments, parks, great avenues, distinguished monuments and buildings, all of which, throughout the years have become important elements in a great and distinguished heritage of this Nation, its Capital.

"Washington," said ex-President Hoover, "is not only the Nation's Capital, it is the symbol of America. By its dignity we stimulate pride in our country." Nothing should be done in the development of Washington which will in any way lower its dignity, destroy its beauty, or compromise its importance.

The proposals of the Highway Program of the Commission of the District of Columbia will not solve the overall problem created by the motor vehicle. In the National Capital Planning Commission's Monograph Number 5, "Moving People and Goods," there is this observation:

"Parts of the problem are interrelated; it is not a street problem, a transit problem or a parking problem. Improvements are needed and a number of plans and proposals have been made. The concentration of so much Federal activity in and around the central business area has produced a rush-hour congestion of vehicles at certain intersections that cannot be handled expeditiously by the present street system. This congestion and delay is both annoying and expensive.

"Solutions can come from four directions:

1. Prevention of further concentration of Federal employment establishments in the congested area together with a better distribution of such employment centers over an extended central area.

2. Development of a thoroughly efficient transit system.

3. Maintenance or development of good residential areas within walking distance of the central area and satellite towns at decentralized Government centers.

4. Development of a plan for improved major highways, expressways, freeways, and parkways, throughout the metropolitan area for use by mass-transportation vehicles and private automobiles supplemented by an adequate and convenient system of parking facilities."

As to the prevention of further concentration of Federal establishments in the central area, we need only cite as an example the near strangulation of cross-town arteries in mid-town New York to emphasize the wisdom of such a preventive program. Although New York and Washington are not comparable in size or in population, there should be no mistaking the seriousness of the problem for Washington. That mid-town New York can function at all is the result of one thing; millions of sub-surface rapid-transit trips are made daily. Not even the beginnings of such a transit facility, in the view of those qualified to judge, would be financially justifiable in Washington in the foreseeable future.

There are, in this matter of concentration, corrective as well as preventive actions that can and should be taken. I refer to the removal

and replacement of temporary buildings. Over 37,000 Federal employees, and the automobiles that they drive to and from work, move in and out of the congested area because of Government activities housed in temporary buildings. The long and sustained effort to remove these disfigurements from the parks of the Central Composition came to an abrupt halt at the start of World War II when a new accumulation of temporary structures was begun. Their removal is still essential to the proper development and use of the central-area parks and to the dignity of the Nation's Capital. The significance of these observations lies in their relation to the long view of the highway planning program. It may be assumed that the reasonable economic life span of a major highway structure is probably not less than forty years. In our judgment, nothing should be planned now on the basis of an abiding uncertainty as to the disposition of these temporary buildings. They should be disposed of early in the economic life of any project worth serious consideration.

The transit system is, of course, not in the province of the National Capital Parks but it should be a matter of concern to the park administrators and to all others concerned with the handling of motor vehicle traffic. The urban traffic problem cannot be solved without adequate mass transportation. The need for better transit facilities in the Washington metropolitan area should be emphasized. Vast expenditures for highway improvements will be wasted in substantial measure if this aspect of the problem is not faced squarely.

Obviously something is wrong with the transit system. There is a high level of Federal employment, great activity in the central area, a growing population, and a large number of persons living within a reasonable range for a transit system. Yet it is reliably reported that the number of transit riders steadily declines and the private automobile, as a commuter vehicle, is used in increasing numbers. As the Planning Commission points out, this is expensive to the commuter and an excessively wasteful use of the public thoroughfares. This cannot be blamed primarily on a lack of adequate highways over which the transit vehicles can operate. On any basis of fair comparison, Washington's highway facilities rank high.

The Planning Commission's reference to the maintenance and development of attractive residential areas near the central area is important. In the context of the Commission's Monograph, the observation refers to travel afoot. We would expand the implications because we believe wholesome living situations in central-city areas must be maintained as one way of saving our great cities. There is much talk of decentralization that may be a confused reference to normal growth. The facts are that, nationwide, the trend of population movement continues to be from the rural areas to the urban areas. There is a pronounced movement to central-city areas, especially by older people.

It would be urban suicide to write off the centers of the cities. They hold attractions, services, and concentrated wealth that cannot be replaced by any suburb. If these high rateables are allowed to decline, where is the money coming from to provide the public facilities that the commuter uses on his daily trips to the city? This is a logical introduction to the Commission's reference to adequate facilities for the motor vehicle. The motor vehicle is essential to our urban life, but it is not an unmixed blessing; its use and misuse are making our in-town areas untenable. Arterial use of local streets is disrupting residential and commercial value and is an infringement on the rights that normally would accrue to the owners of abutting property.

The automobile parking situation is of special concern to the National Capital Parks. The day-long storage of automobiles along both sides of nearly all drives in the central-area parks is a disgrace. To the people of other cities some things are sacred. In New York, for example, the administration does not permit Central Park in Manhattan or Prospect Park in Brooklyn or other parks to be so defaced. This kind of parking should be prohibited in Washington, but it cannot be unless all aspects of the problem are faced; namely, the provision of adequate parking spaces within the City and as well on the periphery of the City (the latter where they may be served by transit lines), the expansion of transit facilities, and the demolition of the Munitions, Navy, and other temporary buildings which occupy park lands.

Traffic engineers have said that congestion tends to be self limiting. This is simply another way of saying that the public patience wears thin and that the public seeks ways of avoiding the congestion. Often these voluntary actions display a lot of common sense. Such an action is the growing trend to park private passenger cars at periphery points served by mass transportation lines. We have been informed that this is taking place in Washington but in a haphazard manner. The car owner is finding this convenient, but the growing number of cars parked throughout the business day where they don't belong, along park drives and in the quiet residential streets of the periphery neighborhoods, is a blight. But this problem can be solved. For example, in Philadelphia, there are in operation now "park-and-ride" services managed by the Transit company; one fee pays for car parking and transit trips. This has worked well and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission is currently planning for the expansion of these services.

As custodians of the Parks in the Central Composition, the administrators of the National Capital Parks play the part of hosts to the millions of tourists who visit Washington each year. The Chamber of Commerce should be interested in the fact that this automobile parking congestion seriously mars the tourist's enjoyment of his Washington visit because these areas constitute the major tourist attractions.

It seems obvious that all agencies concerned in this problem should

join forces in an effort to secure for the Parking Agency legislative authority to acquire sites in the central and on periphery areas for parking lots and garages to be built and operated by private enterprise. The Engineering News Record has reported, "District of Columbia Officials waived 22 zoning and building-code regulations to permit construction of the Washington garage." Building-code modifications are essential to any realistic parking garage program. It would be regrettable not to follow this forward step by a concerted effort to gain legislative authority for the power of eminent domain. The Parking Agency has operated so far without it, but it is illogical to suppose that it can continue to do so effectively. Easily acquired sites will become more and more scarce in the central area. Private enterprise is powerless to condemn and by its own estimate the Parking Agency, as now equipped, is in a race that it can't win. Legislative assistance is required.

The attractive little booklet, published by the National Park Service and entitled "National Capital Parks," tells us that there are 750 reservations totaling approximately 42,000 acres of land in the District of Columbia and in the immediate environs, including the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal which extends from the City to Cumberland, Maryland. In the time left at my disposal I want to tell you a little concerning recent developments which threaten important parts of Washington's park system, established by the Congress on July 16, 1790, almost 165 years ago. There have been many earlier threats to the parks; some of them have materialized and whole parks or parts of parks have been destroyed or crudely modified to make broader and straighter ways for the automobile or to provide sites for buildings and other structures, while other threats have been met by sufficient public resistance so that certain threatened park areas remain intact, at least for the present.

If we are to maintain the park system of Washington to serve the purposes for which it was established, then eternal vigilance and a good deal of patient but vigorous effort, on the part of those who realize the need for preserving the integrity and the beauty of our parks, is necessary.

There are those in public office hereabouts who believe that easy movement of the automobile should take precedence over every other factor in the planning and the use of land. They plan roads along the lines of least resistance and frequently those lines lead over and across lands dedicated for park purposes under the jurisdiction of the National Capital Parks. It is an easy matter for these gentlemen to plan roads and bridges in unbuilt areas where the land will cost nothing; seldom do they appraise park lands in terms of their priceless recreational value, their beauty, their use for those intangible ends which cannot be measured in a practical way.

One of the most serious of all attacks upon the integrity of the plan of the great Central Composition of Washington has been made recently by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. As most of you

know, they have planned a bridge across the Potomac just north of and within the shadow of the Arlington Memorial Bridge. They first planned this crossing at a point further north, opposite "E" Street, where it would have cut Theodore Roosevelt Island in half and completely destroyed this park area for the purposes for which it was dedicated by the Congress in May, 1932. When the Commissioners were defeated in their attempt to destroy Theodore Roosevelt Island they "compromised" by selecting a site for the Potomac River crossing extending westerly from Constitution Avenue. The controversy is still on and, in spite of a reasonable and thoroughly practicable alternative, the substitution of a tunnel for a bridge on this same site, the District Commissioners remain adamant and insist upon a bridge crossing.

If the parks of the Nation's Capital are to be preserved against the continuing attacks which threaten them, including a proposed inner-loop expressway, an extension of an expressway through Rock Creek Park, as well as the destruction of the park lands along the Potomac, including the waters of the River and Theodore Roosevelt Island, it would seem prudent if the authority vested in the District Commissioners to carry out such plans be voided by the Congress and the authority to plan and to replan the parks of this City placed in the office of the National Capital Parks of the National Park Service, where it belongs.

Mr. Elihu Root, in a letter written in 1910 to the late Theodore W. Noyes of this City, wrote:

Untold injury is done by the mistakes that are so frequently made by people of perfectly good intentions, who, without having studied the subject comprehensively, think this, that, or the other thing would be a good thing to do. Things done that way are usually wrong. The beauty of Washington, its superiority over other American cities, comes from the fact that it was started with a plan.

Let us adhere as closely as possible to a plan which a few men are bent on destroying.

Metropolitan Planning for Parks and Open Spaces

T. LEDYARD BLAKEMAN, Area Planning Commission, Detroit, Mich.

AMONG the wide range of problems faced by the people concerned with state and regional planning and development, there is none which is more important nor more difficult to solve than that of obtaining and retaining open spaces in our great metropolitan areas. In addition to providing active and passive recreation for the mass of urban dwellers, these open spaces serve numerous other functions. One of the most important is the *delimitation of communities* within the sprawling mass of metropolitan development, so that the plan has some form and is composed of recognizable entities wherein people can enjoy at least some of the *benefits of small town life*.

In many areas of the country the metropolitan mass or sprawl is broken up by large streams or by steep hillsides in such manner that the planner can with relatively little difficulty produce a livable community pattern. In the Great Lakes Basin, however, and in many other areas of the country we are faced by a complete absence of such natural dividers. There is nothing to prevent anyone building anything within a twenty mile radius of the Detroit City Hall. Furthermore, it is exceedingly difficult to explain to the subdividers and the local governments why they should not do just that.

With the help of Ladislav Segoe of Cincinnati, we have prepared a *land use plan* for the two thousand square miles in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. In addition to major industrial and residential areas, we show a network of parks, public lands and also reservations for agriculture. The parks and public lands proposals have not been studied in detail. For the most part they are a rounding out of existing public lands and plans already proposed by operating park agencies. The additions made by the Regional Planning Commission are of two types: First, *flood plains* which we want to hold open to take care of natural drainage; and second, *green belts* connecting these stream beds in such manner as to delimit communities. It is only recently that we have begun to attempt what might be called a regional parks and open spaces plan.

Our *approach to the land planning job* was first to tie down the needed major *industrial* areas because manufacturing has the most rigid *site requirements*. Then we related the necessary residential communities to the work areas attempting, where possible, to retain interstices of agricultural open space and the stream beds and green belts mentioned above. Having thus determined on the basis of trends and design the *number and location of the people* to be served we are proceeding to plan for sewer, water, highways, retail stores, parks and other services.

In addition to being a valuable service the parks and other open spaces are vital to the development and preservation of a *livable and efficient community pattern*. We, therefore, made the study of open space needs one of our first service studies. The Planner, Bob Carpenter, and Jim Miller, Associate Planner, have been working with a large advisory committee of recreation people for some time now. The results are very discouraging. We figured that in order to arrive at the *demand for Metropolitan Parks*, we would first determine the needs for all types of recreation area; then we would find out how well these needs were being met; *subtract the supply from the demand*; design a system that made up the metropolitan deficit; and put QED on the plan.

Sounds simple enough. Time consuming, yes, but basically simple in general outline. We knew how many people were to be served and we had an inventory of the land theoretically available for open development. It was not too hard to find out what lands were now in

public ownership at all levels of government. Very quickly, however, we discovered that on any reasonable basis the municipalities and townships were terribly deficient in the type of recreation area they should provide. Two of the three counties have no parks. The third county is not only deficient in park area but because of the local deficit the county parks are being developed to serve the intensive recreation purposes which should be met locally. This has shoved the county park demand onto the shoulders of the Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Park Authority. They find themselves under pressure not only to come in a little closer to the center but also to develop active recreation facilities in areas thirty to fifty miles out. State parks fifty to seventy-five miles out are also feeling these pressures.

This means that we have a fight on our hands because parks are in shortest supply in the areas where pressure for residential development is greatest. We have plenty of public land fifty or sixty miles from Detroit. It is like trying to establish a major airport. You can always get plenty of land where you don't need it. The problem is to get the right amount in the right location. When you start telling people they must sacrifice their development rights for the good of the public you have to have some very convincing reasons.

In the area of active local recreation we have some fairly demonstrable facts and figures, but in metropolitan requirements there seems to be a dearth of criteria. How *much picnic, swimming, strolling or sitting area* is needed at various distances from the population concentrations? Can and should we get these areas close enough so that they can be used after work? If so, how do we do it without *bankrupting the metropolis*?

It seems to us that the basic need is for some well substantiated standards. We have checked with national recreation and park organizations; we have checked with other metropolitan agencies; and we have come up with only *one definite fact*, and that is that *nobody* has substantiated standards for the amount and location of metropolitan parks. One further conclusion we have come to is that everybody would like to have them. As a result we are trying to get funds with which to retain a parks consultant to set up a study.

The objective of such a research study would be to investigate existing recreational principles and standards that are commonly being used in metropolitan areas—including urban, rural and regional standards.

There are three major items to be considered in this study. They are: (1) the trend in leisure time—present and future, (2) the place that recreational activity fills in this leisure time and (3) the resulting space and location requirements for recreation.

The trend of leisure time could best be investigated by delving into the reduction of working hours. This would require some study of or

expert opinion on new methods of production, the rising standard of living, movement of the population (centralization and dispersion), and the increasing use of the automobile which has extended the range of recreation possibilities for the average family. It is not enough to investigate just the past trends in the amount of leisure time the American people have, this leisure time has to be projected into the future to get a realistic picture on which to base recreational standards.

The second phase of the problem is concerned with determining what part of the existing and projected leisure time will be taken care of by the recreational function. To find this out the desires and recreational patterns that are growing and changing should be investigated. These patterns result from such factors as the changing composition of the population which include an increasing proportion of older people, a higher level of formal education, and the decreasing size of the average American family, more individual transportation, and many others.

Only after this leisure time and the changing recreational function are investigated in detail can they be expressed in land needs quantitatively and qualitatively. It might be possible to show substantial economies and improved recreational results, (better use of the recreational dollar) and a more satisfied public by a more realistic pattern of recreational land in metropolitan areas. Also, a closer relationship of programs to land economics would be possible. To do all this, the study would have to find out what people do with their leisure time and in what recreational activities people want to participate. Desire sampling might be required to achieve the goals of the study.

The needs for recreation should be determined by age groups, economic groups and by type of recreation areas such as intensive, extensive and water using. These needs should be further defined as to categories of frequency of use (a) daily use—with varying walking distance of those expected to use them, (b) special purpose areas—large general parks, etc., (c) one day outing use, (d) week-end use, and (e) longer vacation. It should then be possible to determine what types of recreation should logically be handled by a metropolitan park system.

Assuming that we know what we want in the way of open spaces how can we get them? This is the \$64 question. I am a great believer in knowing what you want and trying to get it regardless of the obstacles. If you don't have a plan, you don't stand a chance, so I guess preparing a parks and open space plan is the first step. In fact the mere existence of the plan will get some private donations and public appropriations. These, however, will usually account for only a small percentage of the total open space needed.

Keeping private property in agriculture may some day be possible through zoning or something like the British system where the government acquires development rights. This is pretty far off, however, in this country. In the interim we may be able to accomplish something

by withholding the public services prerequisite to urbanization.

All large metropolitan areas either have or are working toward park water, sewer and transportation authorities. If these county or metropolitan agencies could be convinced of the importance of following a land use plan they could carry out much of it by the way they placed their services.

Another great ally whose potential assistance has hardly been tapped is the Public Health administrator. Strict enforcement of septic tank restrictions for instance to prevent development in areas of non-permeable soils would help greatly to hold certain areas open.

Finally, we have a pretty good tool in much of our state enabling legislation for local planning and zoning. The legal power to hold land open without buying it is not too strong. On the other hand many communities have been able to develop quite a nice park system by merely showing it on a plan and buying only when it was threatened by development. It might be possible to apply this official map technique to county, state and even metropolitan plans.

But, we must have some substantiated criteria before we can use any of these means of acquisition.

Enrichment of Living

STERLING S. WINANS, President, American Recreation Society. Read by MILO CHRISTIANSEN, Superintendent of Recreation, District of Columbia

PARKS and open spaces are the physical interpretation of man's seeking after enrichment of his every day living.

The American Recreation Society and its 2400 members salutes the American Planning and Civic Association in the calling of a National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces. The Society has had the privilege of joining in cooperative projects with almost all of the sponsors of this conference. These organizations have demonstrated time and again their sincere desire to help provide for the enrichment of living in this nation.

This conference has the opportunity to make big plans for parks and open spaces which will affect the recreation of millions of people. It has been said that:

Recreation is an individual or a group experience motivated primarily by the pleasure derived therefrom. It takes many forms and may be a planned or a spontaneous activity. It is one of man's principal opportunities for enrichment of living and is the natural expression of certain human interests and needs. (Adopted by the State of California Recreation Commission September 11, 1953.)

It is our purpose to report to the National Citizens Planning Conference on a significant project now under way in California. This undertaking will be of especial interest to you since California representatives

of several of your sponsoring organizations are directly involved in the success of this venture: American Institute of Park Executives, California Society; National Recreation Association; American Institute of Planners; and the California Recreation Society which is affiliated with the American Recreation Society.

Need for a Guide for Planning. The tremendous population increases in California, the fast-growing fringe areas of urban communities, the development of residential subdivisions in areas heretofore considered rural, the need for redevelopment in older portions of metropolitan centers—all are urgent reasons why state and local jurisdictions are seeking land and water areas for public recreation.

Guiding principles and graded standards are necessary and should be formulated. The best experience of some communities should be made available to all communities. People need and are demanding land and water areas for purposes of recreation in older metropolitan centers, in the fast-growing fringe areas and in urban areas heretofore considered rural. That planning and recreation agencies can make sound recommendations for the type and number of land and water areas to be acquired, a planning guide is necessary. Principles, criteria and standards are urgently needed which reflect the (1) topographic and climatic variations, (2) variety in natural resources, and (3) differences in density of population; age distribution and family income of communities. The guide must be applicable to communities in mountain, valley and desert regions and to populated centers along ocean beaches and inland waterways. Such a guide is not available. The California Committee on Planning for Recreation and Park Areas and Facilities proposes to help meet this need.

A year ago, President Eisenhower, in his housing message to Congress, brought into sharp focus the planning of our cities and towns. Pointing to slum conditions and all that they mean in human misery, crime and expenditure of public funds, he highlighted the futility of merely appropriating funds to clear slums *after* they happen. He suggested that every means should be used to prevent slums and that the principal tool available for such a task is competent city planning, both in the laying out of new urban areas and in preserving existing areas against becoming slums.

Sponsors. The survey of existing standards and formulation of a guide for planning is directed by a committee of sponsors. Members of the sponsoring committee represent statewide voluntary organizations and agencies, and agencies of state government; as well as national organizations:

Voluntary Organizations:

- American Institute of Architects
- American Institute of Park Executives, California Society
- American Institute of Planners

California Association for Health Education, Physical Education
and Recreation

California Association of Landscape Architects

California Recreation Society

County Supervisors Association of California

League of California Cities

National Recreation Association

State of California:

Recreation Commission

Department of Education

Department of Natural Resources, Division of Beaches and Parks

University of California, Department of City and Regional Plan-
ning, and Department of Architecture, Berkeley

The sponsoring committee formulated and submitted a request to the Rosenberg Foundation of San Francisco and procured funds to finance the project, including a survey and formulation of a guide for planning. A grant of \$25,000 was made to the Committee to help finance a one-year study. Sponsoring organizations are supplementing the grant with services in kind amounting to \$9,000, making an investment of \$34,000 in the planning of open spaces for the leisure of people.

Dr. Josephine Randall, formerly superintendent of recreation in San Francisco has been employed as project director. Planning technicians and a research writer will assist. George Hjelte, General Manager, Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, and Paul Oppermann, San Francisco Planning Director, have been employed as consultants. Upon completion of the staff work, the sponsoring committee must assume the responsibility for the approval of the guide and will then recommend the guide to state organizations for adoption.

The committee of sponsors has three primary objectives well in mind:

1. To conduct a comprehensive survey and study of the needs, experience and best practice in California communities, as related to planning for the acquisition and development of recreation and park areas and facilities under public ownership in urban and populated centers.

2. To formulate a guide containing principles, criteria and graded standards for the planning of public recreation areas and facilities.

3. To present these principles, criteria and standards in a guide appropriate for adoption by the Committee and by a Statewide Advisory Council on Planning for Recreation and Park Areas and Facilities, and by

Organizations representing agencies of local government;

Recreation, park and planning boards;

Statewide, regional and local voluntary planning bodies;

Professional societies in the recreation and planning fields;

Private consulting firms in the planning field; and

Interested agencies and organizations.

Project Method. The method of conducting the project, under direction of the sponsoring committee, consists of the following:

1. To determine the essential types and number of recreation areas and facilities needed in urban communities and neighborhoods.

Assemble and analyze previous studies on the recreation interest, habits and needs of people, which studies have been conducted by universities, colleges, state agencies and voluntary organizations.

Survey and analyze the number and types of recreation and park areas and facilities existent in communities of various population ranges.

2. To define and describe recreational land and water areas and facilities suited to neighborhoods, districts (portion of a larger city), communities, regions (portion of one or more counties) and counties. Types and number of land and water areas and facilities needed will be related to factors such as:

Authority granted in state enabling legislation, including re-development and urban renewal procedures;

Availability of raw land areas;

Cost of development and recurring maintenance;

Intensity of social need;

Natural or artificial barriers;

Population density and age of population in a given center;

Proximity of natural recreation resources;

Topography and climatic conditions;

Traffic load and pattern.

3. To collect information on best experience and practice of California Communities in planning for the acquisition and development of recreation and park areas and facilities:

Make an analysis of principles, criteria and standards referred to in recreation studies and master plans of California communities;

Analyze standards referred to in publications of state and national recreation and planning agencies.

4. To formulate and submit a preliminary guide for planning to the sponsoring committee for analysis, and for analysis and recommendation by the advisory committee.

5. To revise the guide, taking cognizance of the revisions recommended by the sponsoring committee, and resubmit the guide for approval of the sponsoring committee.

6. To collect sample layouts of recreation and park areas and facilities, including sketches, photographs and plans of areas and facilities which illustrate guiding principles, criteria and standards.

7. To prepare a final report to be submitted to the sponsoring committee for publication.

Advisory Council

The Advisory Council on Planning for Recreation and Park Areas

and Facilities has been appointed by the sponsoring committee and is composed of at least 60 members representing:

- Lay recreation and planning boards in state and local government;
- Professional societies in the recreation and planning fields;
- Departments of planning, public administration, and architecture of universities and colleges;
- Professional recreation and park administrators and planning directors;
- Statewide, regional and local voluntary planning bodies;
- Private consulting firms in the planning field;
- Interested agencies and organizations.

The advisory council will meet at least twice during the continuance of the project, to advise the sponsoring committee, by:

1. Reviewing the method employed in the project;
2. Reviewing principles, criteria and standards proposed by the sponsoring committee;
3. Recommending approval or revision of principles, criteria and standards;
4. Encouraging the adoption and use of the guide.

Final Report

The completed guide will be published by the State of California Recreation Commission. It may include sample layouts of recreation and park areas and facilities illustrating guiding principles and standards approved by the sponsoring committee.

Complimentary copies of the final report will be made available to the members of the sponsoring committee and advisory council, and to interested agencies and organizations.

Agencies and organizations having representation on the sponsoring committee and the advisory council are not bound to adopt the guiding principles and graded standards as approved by the sponsoring committee. It is the obligation of the sponsoring committee to present the principles and standards to interested statewide and local agencies and organizations and to encourage the adoption and use of the report.

Counsel Welcomed. The sponsoring committee, under the chairmanship of Richard Rathfon, City Planner of Sacramento, continues to seek the comment and counsel of organizations and leaders represented in this National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces. Leaders in professional recreation and planning organizations have assured the sponsoring committee that a guide to planning will be of value to communities all over the nation. The support of this project by the American Planning and Civic Association and this National Citizens Conference is a source of great encouragement to all of us.

Colloquium: What Can the People Do About Parks and Open Spaces?

FREDERICK GUTHEIM, Washington, D. C., Moderator

WHETHER we call them "the people" or "the public" or by some other name, we are talking about ourselves. We are talking about the people who pay for parks and open spaces, who want them because they will use them, and whose votes at elections and bond referenda will be required to get them. We take counsel with each other in associations of various kinds, and much of our action in behalf of parks and open spaces is taken through the same organizations. Three of the speakers on this panel represent such associations—each widely different from the other and the three of them, perhaps, to be taken as representing the range of such groups. The fourth speaker represents that most important institution, the press.

I take it we have two important questions to examine today. The first is to preserve and protect the limited amounts of open space we have from encroachment, neglect and other compromises with their essential use as natural and recreation areas. Buildings, parking lots and other uses threaten park lands in many cities; and only a vigilant, well-informed and well-organized public can be counted on to protect them against the multitude of special interests, each intent upon their own concerns, who menace them. The second is to give some attention to the need for new parks and additional open spaces, particularly in the fringe areas where development is building by the square mile. Here we have a need not only for neighborhood parks and recreation areas, but for larger regional parks. And we have new requirements for preserving conservation areas, stream valley flood plains, watersheds, wild life reservations, forest areas and agricultural districts, both for their own sake as valuable elements in the metropolitan area, as well as for the contribution they can make to the shaping of a well-planned city, a city of well-formed communities rather than of undifferentiated sprawling development. Public ownership may be necessary to implement such planning, but we are obliged to consider whether zoning or other forms of land-use control can be effective in accomplishing the same purpose.

Both of these questions require the same techniques of local citizens action. If we can get something started here, perhaps it will spread throughout the country.

MRS. LEROY CLARK, Englewood, New Jersey

THROUGH the membership of The Garden Club of America there is an ever increasing feeling of responsibility for the preservation of parks and the open spaces which are being taken over by a rapidly

multiplying population and additional highways. Through the Conservation and National Parks Committees information is disseminated through the Clubs of the country and through their members to students and adults on important issues. They are urged to be particularly alert in their own States and never to forget their national responsibility.

Those in my own State of New Jersey joined in the successful effort to preserve Island Beach in spite of the desire of a real estate company to purchase it, thereby saving the only untouched stretch of seashore on the Atlantic coast with its rare flora.

It is noteworthy that in these days of shorter working hours the Carpenters and Joiners of America were prevailed upon to contribute \$75,000 to complete the purchase of Mettlers Woods, a stand of virgin forest.

The Wharton tract and Worthington property have been acquired by the State, each of value in its own way.

The County Park systems are being developed as well as other State Parks and roadside parks are increasing in number, inspired by an active Roadside Council which contributed funds for teaching roadside beautification to students of highway engineering at Stevens Institute.

It was the people who persuaded the States of New York and New Jersey to end the quarrying of the great cliffs of the Hudson. The Palisades Interstate Park Commission was formed by an act of Congress. Land was acquired by purchase and gift of all available property overlooking the river.

The Borough of Ft. Lee for the past three years has failed to accept an offer for the historic land south of the George Washington Bridge where our first President was in Camp when Cornwallis crossed the Hudson hoping to capture his army. There is still hope.

The Palisades Interstate Park Commission has allowed the Palisades Nature Association an area of 148 acres for the development of a wild-life sanctuary, known as Greenbrook. Over five miles of trails have been brushed for the study and enjoyment of those who wish to learn of the flora and fauna of the region. It is being restored to what it would have been without past destruction by fire and storm.

This is not adequate but it is a demonstration of what interested people can accomplish if there is the will and a realization of the need.

GRADY CLAY, *The Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Ky.

WE ARE come together to comment on the crisis abroad in our land, the crisis caused by a growing population, by increased pressure for land, by the competitive battle for open spaces in our metropolitan areas.

May I qualify myself as a non-expert in these matters by saying that I am a fairly consistent non-member of board commissions, or committees, official or otherwise, having to do with such matters. As a newspaperman, I'm much more at home describing the world as I see it, rather than prescribing for the world as I should like it to be.

At any rate, we should examine the issue before us. Is it really a fundamental issue? Or is it merely another in the series of problems caused by an expanding economy—and a debate over *whose* open space must be preserved, protected and created?

I would say there is strong evidence that the American public is *sold* on open space. It wants all it can get. It is paying staggering sums of open space, more or less willingly. It is especially sold on that particular kind of open space usually identified as Lot 110 in Broad Acres, said lot containing 9000 square feet, more or less, and one free-standing house obtainable by paying \$11,800 (and up), with \$550 down plus closing costs, the rest in *easy monthly payments*.

This is open space—private, fenceable, negotiable—and when the grass grows too fast, almost unmanageable. Since World War I some 7½ million families have paid what was considered good money (before inflation) for this kind of open space.

I am sure these people are not to be condemned as low, base, materialistic and lacking in all public spirit if they display far more enthusiasm for such private open space than they have shown for public open spaces paid for by such unmentionable or conversely damnable methods as bond issues and taxes.

Now this great urge towards open spaces is, I believe a tribute to the success of such organizations as the American Planning and Civic Association. I suspect the work of yours, and allied groups, has fostered, if not created, a great and unfulfilled desire in millions of Americans to enjoy open spaces—even if it means paying through the nose for the dubious pleasure of fighting crabgrass, shopping centers, traffic and other benefits of suburban life.

Of course, this flight toward the new amenities of the suburbs has left behind a horrible nest of troubles, which I expect is one of the most important reasons why we're here.

If we're Democrats, we resent all those good city Democrats who moved to the suburbs and started voting Republican. If we're city-lovers who are fighting to preserve some measure of charm and amenity in an old residential neighborhood near the center of town, we resent all those people who move out to Long Brook Acres, and spend all their civic energies on the suburban PTA, rather than on efforts to pass a bond issue for a downtown park.

At this point, I hope you won't mind my telling you of my friend and his new Coffeemaster.

He and his wife had their first cups of coffee from that bright, shiny

new Coffeemaster last Christmas morning. They had read the ads about the brave new mechanized world that the modern appliances, the Coffeemasters and all the rest, would automatically provide. But after they drank their coffee, my friend says, "We looked at each other and realized we were disappointed. We finally figured it out—all the damn thing did was make coffee."

Somehow, as a result of being oversold, my friend expected *something more than coffee*.

And I fear that if we expect too much of parks, playgrounds and open space, we too shall be disappointed.

So let me stick in a word of caution, as a victim of expecting too much. . . . Let us not fall into the trap of thinking that if only we have enough parks, playground and open space, our jangled nerves will relax, our juvenile delinquents will become bird watchers, our densities automatically drop 50 percent, our incomes double, our tax bills come down, and the suburban boom will be deflated, land values in our city stabilized, and all the "best people" will move back into town so they can pay lower taxes, run for the City Council and serve on the Park Board. . . .

Such an attitude forces the parks into substituting for Church, State, Home and Mother—and of course this is too big a burden.

May I spend just a few moments describing some of the things which I think the public *can* do—not in every city, and not in the same way. We are all in debt to Dennis O'Harrow of the American Society of Planning Officials for his superb editorial in the current ASPO NEWS-LETTER reminding us that one of the great things about this country is that "there is greater strength in diversity than there is in uniformity, that out of about 3,000 separate zoning ordinances in the United States, there is bound to come a variety of approaches from which we can choose, in contrast to a Federal formula requiring uniformity, unanimity, and—monotony."

The public can do many things, because the public itself is a many-sided thing. There are many publics, and each can contribute in its own distinct way to the promotion—or the destruction—of good cities.

First. There is the *do-it-yourself public*—which is currently supporting a billion-dollars worth of sales of seeds, plows that throw the dirt *this* way, plows that churn the dirt *that* way—a billion dollars worth of business done last year among amateur gardeners. Not to mention the do-it-yourself workshop fans, boat-builders, house-builders and all the rest.

This part of the public, I am confident, will respond with enthusiasm, vigor, and high spirits to an imaginative and well-organized effort to create *a park in a day*. The soil-conservation movement has worked wonders with its *farm in a day* extravaganza—turning a farm-improve-

ment project into a community affair with bulldozers, hoopla, lunch on the grounds, and all the rest.

Second. There is the small but tremendously effective part of the public working on urban renewal. In Louisville, this consists of little more than a mere handful of FHA officials, city officials, and a team of builders and real estate men.

The new center of power in park-promotion, certainly in most old cities, is beginning to shift into this urban renewal field—while the garden clubs and the traditional park-lovers remain completely on the outside, certainly in my own community. Urban renewal—especially the provisions of Title I for urban redevelopment as it was called by the Democratic administration—offers perhaps the greatest opportunity in a generation to create new playgrounds, parks and open spaces in old congested districts. As an observer, let me voice the hope that *more people, more public groups* can get into this urban renewal struggle, and combine forces.

Third. Another segment of the public loves *music, picnicking*—or just bread and circuses. In Louisville, the parks program received a wonderful boost from two happy circumstances—a \$50,000 gift for purchase of land along the Ohio River; and a civic orchestra with a director of the “I’ll-try-anything-once” variety. Not once but twice last summer they produced a waterfront concert, with the orchestra on a barge in the River. Some 20,000 people came to picnic, and listen. A Circuit Judge had the time of his life shooting off the cannon for the 1812 overture and at intermission we all enjoyed the carefully scheduled fireworks of a private country club on a nearby hill. . . .

Fourth. The auto driving public can and will flock with pleasure to suburban parks if they are provided. (And, lacking parks, they will, cause and already are causing, serious destruction to farmers’ crops for 30 miles around most big cities, parking off the roads, stealing corn and other portable crops.)

I believe the expansion of parks is almost a generation behind the expansion of automobile ownership. Cities fight desperately to raise money for expensive parks, downtown or in the highly competitive suburban areas.

I would hate to see these efforts sidetracked, but I would suggest that the public will use and support wilderness-type parks up to 40 miles from City Hall. This will take some of the week-end pressure off the already overcrowded city parks. . . .

In Louisville, we are fortunate in having Otter Creek Park, a former CCC project, given by the Federal government to Louisville, and now run by the city—a 2,000 acre semi-wilderness of rough scenic land overlooking the Ohio, near Fort Knox. On busy week-ends thousands of families enjoy it. Fortunately, a major new road into the park will soon be built.

Fifth. There is a segment of the public which, I believe, will support your efforts to create parks and playgrounds by the sanitary landfill method. In my opinion, the use of incinerators to burn up city garbage and trash is one of the most shortsighted aspects of modern city planning. This material should be used to fill up useless old quarries, sandpits, claypits, sloughs, gulleys, and unusable valleys, converting them into playgrounds, often in the midst of heavily populated areas. We in Louisville already have filled one great slough, creating Lannan Park in our crowded Portland area. And another former slough of a diverted creek is now filled. Unfortunately, our City administration never enforced good sanitary practises at the landfill, and public outcry against the stink has resulted in a bond issue for a new incinerator . . . thus losing a chance to create possibly 500 to 1,000 acres of usable parkland in what are now sloughs, flooded areas, and wastelands within or bordering on the city limits.

Sixth. I believe the public can and will support the kind of *big thinking* that produced the multiple-use developments of natural resources in the Tennessee Valley, and in the Great West, if that *big thinking* is applied to such *big projects* as turnpikes.

As it is now being built, the Kentucky Turnpike is a 30-mile-long limited-access road from Louisville south to Elizabethtown, a wonderful traffic artery, built single-mindedly with only one-purpose—moving traffic. It has one stretch eight miles long absolutely straight—evidence of the slide-rule mind at work, regardless of contours, property lines, the necessity for visual variety, or the resulting uneconomic division of land.

I believe the public will support a program that can convert these giant and expensive jobs into multiple-benefit projects, so that the rights-of-way can be wide enough to provide parklands, accessible from the countryside; so that the drainage ditches can be expanded into great retention ponds where necessary to control flash floods in the neighborhood (all too often caused by the expressway construction),—so that these retention ponds can be stabilized at a water level sufficient to provide fishing, boating and other benefits, even if this means getting into that knotty field of excess condemnation, I believe there will be public support for it.

Seventh. There is a real need for opportunists in this, the public's business, just as they are needed in the pursuit of private business in a fast-changing society. It took a real opportunist in the Mayor's office in Louisville to hire a skilled tax-and-title lawyer to pick up 75 parcels of land with confused or bad titles—convert them into totlots in crowded neighborhoods—a great piece of opportunism.

But beyond this kind of opportunism, the public wants and I believe will support really big plans if they are made clear, repeated and described by words, simple maps, clear pictures, and repeated, repeated,

repeated, until every schoolchild can be familiar with the big ideas. . .

In my own community, such a plan is lacking. Parks and playgrounds in the new suburban subdivisions are acquired by the Robin Hood technique.

Our local Planning and Zoning Commission, motivated by the highest public motives, plays Robin Hood by forcing a few big subdividers to cough up playground space without being paid for it, letting those who are close to county schools, or those with small projects, go scot free, and doing it all without any overall plan whatever.

If this helter-skelter operation is typical of what happens in most communities, then it is no wonder that some of the public is lukewarm about lending its support for parks and playgrounds. . . .

In conclusion—despite the self-centered suburbanites, the self-seeking land-slaughturers who cut up the countryside with no regard for scenic values—despite the continued fight to chip and slice at our great public parklands—I believe we can all be guided by the statement of J. B. Jackson, editor of *Human Geography*, who said man's motives are, and should remain "the re-creation of Heaven on earth. . ."

GEORGE C. HAYWARD, Executive Secretary, Citizen Development Committee,
Cincinnati, Ohio

THIS assignment was accepted with some reluctance through the realization that I might not be in complete agreement with some of the attitudes of the audience. Please let me observe that; (1) in great share it is the many in this audience together with the American Planning and Civic Association to whom we are indebted in this country for the parks and open spaces we enjoy, (2) in having selected this panel from activities somewhat outside the subject field it must be that impartial advice is needed or is at least sought, and (3) because of (1) and in spite of (2) it may be difficult to make points to the fullest intent and possibility.

Actually, there is a very simple way but I maintain it is a superficial way, to describe what would be a most productive method of creating and preserving open areas. It would be to establish an official agency such as a Park Board with as completely autonomous powers as could be made available. Influential and wealthy people would be appointed to operate the agency and they would be enticed by the eminence of the agency and their control of it to donate money or properties as needed for a development plan. Arrangements could conceivably be made for bequeathing of the positions to family members to encourage endowments and other permanence of the scheme. It would be further insurance to create a strong citizens' group to bolster and protect this group.

This method has been highly successful in a number of cities and it is easily imagined that it can be completely justified in the minds of many enthusiasts for the cause.

As a professional city planner and a respecter of the over-all and coordinating principles of this profession as it must prevail in all sound and equitable government, I cannot hold conscientiously with this approach. Briefly it is in conflict with (1) governmental organization by allowing a phase to become prominent and strong for the most part according to the degree of promotion, and possibly *emotion*, that can be developed; (2) the approach of over-all planning which should consider all phases of community development and activity in their proper places and retain the balance of priority and expenditure of monies; (3) the hierarchy likely to be established is certain to make the community planning and development rigid, which is without question a most harmful effect that can be envisioned by a sincere and able planner.

If it is any consolation to the good people who adhere to the park and open space principle as one of paramount importance, I have confirmed beliefs that all of their warranted dreams will be just as realizable and longer lasting through cooperating with other elements of community operations. Those who have felt remorse that the City Beautiful moment lost prominence should certainly accept the fact that planning for people basically and achieving those basics is certain to produce eventually the aesthetic attributes. It is my very frank attitude that unless there is a strong element of economic or economically social justification, a priority position should not be accorded to any publicly financed project.

We on this panel have been asked to speak from personal experience to illustrate our points. I hope I can cite some convincing points from my experience during the last 20 years in planning administration for three of several cities. In Flint, Michigan the automobile industry dominates the economic base as it does in several Michigan cities. It was my good fortune to inherit some outstanding studies and proposals ranging from urban redevelopment through traffic plans to civic center ideas. The need, plans and potential financing have been available in Flint for many years. The situation has changed very little, not through lack of appreciation, but through the preponderance of the basic problem. It is my fond hope that in developing interest in their community and seeing the wonderful opportunities, they will overcome this overpowering obstacle. Again, Flint needs to broaden its economic base.

Cincinnati enjoys a long history of early, as well as up-to-date planning provided by as impressive a list of staff, consultants and citizen agency members as could be found in any community in the United States. Until recent years there has been no motivating coordinated spirit or conviction as to community improvement being essential. Although there is positive evidence of some of this need being met there

still must be increased momentum and certainly continuing inspiration to result in really worthwhile accomplishment.

As a Hoosier, I read with great distress a recent detailed account in the *National Municipal Review* that the Indiana State Legislature had again defeated a bill which could have made possible the installation of the city manager form of government. For all of the admitted imperfections of the city manager form of government, it is regarded as the best available. It certainly would be an improvement on existing municipal government in Indiana. It is almost the only remaining State in the entire Union whose laws stand in the way of making use of this modern businesslike manner and still democratic form of governmental administration. I witnessed in Fort Wayne the accepted pattern of changeover of city hall administration at election time which reverses the position of a department head from a lowest position to the top position at every change of political party domination at City Council. Almost the only municipal positions which have seemed to be immune to this ridiculous manipulation are those of the Planning Commission's staff, but even here a partisan aspect has crept in. Indiana planning statutes have been amended to provide that the citizen members shall not all be from the same political party. As might be expected, this has drawn political attention to the situation to the extent that political considerations have been encouraged to become a factor in Planning Commission activities.

I maintain that complete and permanent good living can be enjoyed in no city until basic wrongs are corrected. These cities may not be facing eventual bankruptcy through disintegration or the many other threats to preservation, but Flint would do well to correct completely its dependency on a single-type industry, one-corporation industry; Fort Wayne should fully realize its precarious position due to its antiquated government; and Cincinnati must maintain and even exceed its start on a drive to rebuild and revitalize its area. The tools of planning, administration, financing, laws, etc., are available to at least workable degrees and certainly the more alert communities threaten to outdistance those which are reluctant to make changes standing in the way of progress. Inevitably the distraction of incidental objectives, important as they may seem to their proponents, can be the defeating cause even to the extent of reacting terrifically against the special cause involved.

There is some irony in the fact that all three of the cities discussed here have outstanding parks and open areas which are bound to be involved in any aggressive program to improve on other community facilities. These problems must be anticipated with a broad understanding of what is best for the community. In Cincinnati two essential playfields will be destroyed by parts of the drastically needed expressways. The Cincinnati Metropolitan Master Plan was prepared very

carefully and with high regard for playfields and all other elements of the community plant. Provisions has been made in the Plan for these two playfields and other dislocated facilities, which is as it should be.

It is realized that there may be even more irony in the situation in which Cincinnati is being used as an example of how parks and open spaces are being given their fair treatment. The facts that the city enjoys about 20 miles of Ohio River frontage for an average width of about a quarter of a mile, and a comparatively low population density make the picture probably less severe. Also, the very hilly topography of Cincinnati contributes to the fact that the city contains a population of a half million in about 75 square miles while the Cleveland population of twice Cincinnati's size occupies about exactly the same sized area.

From those who are acquainted with the objectives and accomplishments of the Citizens Development Committee for which I work in Cincinnati, there might be the contention that we are currently addressing ourselves to certain elements which do not include some of these developments such as parks and open spaces. It is a hard fact that we have pursued the programs for expressways, off-street parking, master airport and urban redevelopment almost without any deviation during most of our 12 years of existence. We maintain:

1. That the very fact that it has taken the coordinating effort of all elements to get these phases finally under way is adequate justification for concentration.
2. That these basic improvements are so sadly needed that the economic and entire well being of the community is at stake.
3. That with proper planning and follow through, all of the improvements included in the Master Plan will result as rapidly as financing and construction can proceed.
4. That urban redevelopment which is now expanding into urban renewal provides in itself for the realization of all elements of community development from railroads to neighborhood playgrounds. Cincinnati is scheduled for about 25 percent of the entire incorporated area to be *renewed*, more than 5 percent of which will be completely cleared and rebuilt or *redeveloped*. So that assuming good planning, completely adequate provision will be made for parks and open spaces throughout a large part of the city by this process.

Up to this point it is my sincere hope that at least some of you listeners are willing to accept some of my contentions that, in order to realize the creation and retention of facilities such as parks, playgrounds, etc., the greatest assurance is the provision of a fundamental approach which will automatically insure a warranted program and in probably the most orderly and natural manner. Some suggestions of almost elementary but important aspect from my own experience and opinion are:

1. Be sure that your community has an organized group which is fully capable of discussion, presenting and proposing a solution to the basic

needs of the community. This could be a promotional, fact finding or administrative agency such as a private development group, a bureau of governmental research, an official planning agency or, ideally, all of these groups working together. Needless to say, the appointees should be the most respected and busiest citizens.

2. A common understanding must be arrived at on as many as possible of basic considerations, after which there must be a minimum of deviations.

3. Under no circumstances can the organization be permitted to exist for the sake of general principles alone.

4. The most expert assistance in preparing programs or plans should be obtained. In the instance of participation from several government agencies, conflicts with plans or other developments can be avoided or adjusted through preparation of such plans as far in advance as possible of the other agencies.

5. Be prepared to make concessions as long as the overall good of the community is realized. For instance, in any community which has a park system of respectable dimensions, it is almost impossible to avoid crossing or using part of the system for some other units of the plan.

6. In another direction, the degree of sacredness attributed by some to open areas will never be appreciated when unrealistic attitudes such as prohibiting automobile traffic from large acreages persist. Many times this automatically eliminates the facilities from probably the most needful elements of the populations such as older citizens, families with young children, physically handicapped and those who lose interest when inconveniences are apparent. The modern concept of public library location and design based on the premise that value is generally measured by the extent of use is a good principle to follow for almost all publicly financed projects.

7. Above all, there must be a support, in so far as reasonable, of the programs of others. In almost all things there are and should be considerations of available financing, etc., so that a turn must be waited for, which in the simple process of bargaining, should react to the advantage of the cooperator.

8. There is no room in the operations for civic achievement for any individuals or groups looking for self-aggrandizement in any way.

9. There is little room for sentiment despite the fact that some significant accomplishments have been won through emotional promotion. There is always a question as to how long such gains can be assured.

I can realize how difficult it would be for some to obtain a complete plan of action from these remarks. In the first place, it is impossible for anyone to devise an approach that will fit every problem. Secondly, there is bound to be some degree of prejudice which even the giver of advice should be willing to admit. Also, it is sometimes necessary to impress advice on some with exaggerations which is of course liable to

be misunderstood by others. A final observation is that no goal must be approached with an attitude of all importance or seriousness to the extent that all opposition is expected to melt away and concede to the complete wishes of any group regardless of how fine a goal they may believe they have.

These advisory points that have been set forth have worked to an extent in one situation, and it is believed that they will at least provoke some serious thought which will evenuate in some advantage to your causes. It would be well to remember, just as any planner must, that times change and sometimes quite rapidly. We have heard of the rapid changeover of our ways of life to present day life resulting from the greatly increased amount of leisure time. You people have been using that as a point of impressing the importance of your program. I think you would do well to consider at the same time the other changes such as attitudes that have come about through present day methods of communication, transportation and other fundamental considerations.

Question: Professor H. O. Whittemore of the University of Michigan, asked if Ohio River cities were directing their planning for park and recreation facilities in river frontage.

Answer: There has been and continues to be tremendous pressure from all types of selfish interest groups to *protect* Ohio River frontage at Cincinnati from floods with levees or walls. The Cincinnati Master plan has not held with this point of view except for the protection by a barrier dam of the huge Mill Creek industrial valley against Ohio River floods and Mill Creek flash floods. In a way this answers a point of the preceding talk by emphasizing that the Master Plan arrived at its stand on the basis of economics for the most part which viewpoint is shared by the U. S. Corps of Army Engineers. Many acres of accessible property are involved, but no sections are justified for protection by the Army Engineers' formula.

The Master Plan pursues this simple realistic treatment by suggesting uses which would either not be harmed by floods or could be provided with self-protection. For instance recreation and parking areas do not warrant protection and buildings can be so designed or arranged that lower floors can withstand occasional inundation.

The decision therefore was based solely on economics or function, although had it been necessary, some additional points would have been raised in support of the type of proposed uses and against the construction of floodwall, etc. The unattractiveness and obstacle to river view which would result from flood protection structures would have had considerable opposition also from those in favor of locating recreation areas along the river front from the point of need, accessibility, etc., beyond the argument for views and generally attractive appearance.

Another point to illustrate the thesis of the earlier remarks is in regard to the priority of developments. The downtown connecting link

of the Cincinnati expressways system called the Third Street Distributor has been recognized as a first priority and is now proceeding rapidly in construction plans, property acquisition, and site clearance. This facility will require such a large portion of the central riverfront area and its design will have such a determining influence on the balance of the area that the redevelopment of the central river front is almost certain to follow. Had it not been for the fortunate situation that dictated the location, design, etc., of this expressway facility, it is quite likely that there would never have been a chance for the riverfront project. This illustrates that not only is it necessary in the logical course of events to give priority to basics but that there are tremendous supporting advantages which accrue in this process to bring about the other elements.

JAMES McCLAIN, Planning Director,
Allegheny Conference on Community Development, Pittsburgh, Pa.

TODAY, the provision of parks and playgrounds is commonly accepted as a public function. It is increasingly recognized, moreover, that public agencies should not only provide the facilities but should also furnish instruction and supervision in their use. Nevertheless, private citizens, working both as dedicated individuals and as civic groups, have made an incalculable contribution to the park and playground movement nationally; and it is the thesis of this colloquium that citizen participation is still essential.

The modern park movement in this country is actually not very old. Central Park, purchased by New York City in 1853, was among the first of the municipal acquisitions. The early concept of parks, however, was one of *passive recreation*. The *active recreation* movement is said to have started with the establishment of sand gardens in Boston by the Massachusetts Emergency and Hygiene Association in 1887. About the turn of the century, the park and playground movements joined forces to the mutual benefit of both. In the years since then, not only have the facilities multiplied, but the scope of the recreation concept has been greatly broadened and diversified, so that it now embraces all segments of the population, all age groups of both sexes, all year round, and all sizes of service area from local to national.

At different times and places throughout this movement, the citizen role has taken a great variety of forms. Many recreational projects and functions have started out as civic undertakings and later have been transferred to official agencies. Civic crusades have helped to preserve historic sites and places of exceptional natural beauty or interest. Private philanthropy has played an important part in nearly every locality. What can the people do about it? The people can do a great deal, and they are doing it.

In the Pittsburgh area, the Allegheny Conference on Community Development has been quite active in the recreation field. A word or two as to its set-up will be helpful to a better understanding of its activities and methods. A group of leading citizens organized the Conference in 1943, originally for the purpose of seeking solutions to Pittsburgh's post-war and post-depression problems, but it was recognized from the outset that the responsibility would be a continuing one. At present, the Conference is composed of 87 sponsors (in effect, its board of directors) who meet quarterly; an executive committee of 21 of the sponsors which meets monthly, and a relatively small paid staff. It is financed through the Civic-Business Council, which is the fund raising agency for the Chamber of Commerce and several other civic bodies. The Conference's success is due in no small measure to the soundness of its policies. Top business executives serve on its working committees personally, instead of sending substitutes. It strives for the broadest co-ordination of effort across all civic and political lines, working *with*, rather than trying to supplant, existing agencies. An effective public relations procedure is guided by the assistant director, who is a trained public relations expert. The Conference works very closely with the Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association, which is sometimes called the technical arm of the Conference; in fact, the two organizations have the same president and the same executive director, and their offices are almost adjoining.

In order to illustrate citizen participation relating to parks and playgrounds in the Pittsburgh area, I have chosen three fairly recent examples which are quite different, not only in character but also in service area: the first concerns a small community, the second is of city-wide significance, while the third is regional in character.

West View is a residential suburban borough located just five airline miles northwest of Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle. Its 1950 population was 7,581. Its 1.02 square mile area comprises mostly hills and valleys. The one large level tract of 30 acres, right in the heart of the borough, is occupied by a commercial amusement park.

Some time ago, West View parents became concerned about their children spending too much time, and perhaps money, in the amusement park. The children, however, could hardly be blamed, as they had virtually no place else to play. Nearly all of the buildable area had long since been developed, with little thought being given to recreational needs. Even the schools had very inadequate play yards.

A group of civic-minded citizens organized to remedy this deficiency. They succeeded in arousing local pride and also needled the Town Council into creating an official Recreation Board, which Pennsylvania law permits boroughs to do. The Council created the Board in September, 1953, and also allocated funds for its initial operations.

The newly formed Recreation Board came to us for technical assistance in the preparation of a long-range plan for the development of recreational facilities in West View. We made a careful study of the recreational needs of the various age groups, including population forecasts, inventory of present facilities and programs, topography and land use, neighborhood patterns, schools, available sites, etc., and presented our report in August, 1954. It was adopted unanimously by the Recreation Board and the Town Council. The Board has acquired its first playground site and is proceeding to develop it.

The West View example clearly demonstrates how other small communities might effectively face their recreational problems. The steps are: (1) form a vigorous citizens' group, (2) arouse local pride, (3) obtain official support and, if legislation permits, official status, (4) secure qualified technical assistance, and (5) carry out the plan.

The second example is the new Point State Park, comprising 36 acres at the tip of the Golden Triangle, where the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers join to form the Ohio. This strategic spot was the site of four successive pioneer forts, the last and by far the largest of which was the second Fort Pitt completed in 1761. It has been said that the question of whether the civilization of inland America was to be French or British was largely determined at this location. The Point also served in the early days as a "Gateway to the West" for countless westward moving pioneers. George Washington, visiting the site as a young man, was among the first to appreciate its strategic value and recommended its fortification.

Generations of Pittsburghers had discussed the establishment of a park at the Point to commemorate its historic significance, but nothing was actually done about it until the Allegheny Conference undertook the project in 1946. The entire 36-acre site has now been acquired by the State at a cost of \$7½ million and cleared of buildings. Much of the grading has been completed and construction of the park is well under way. In the early stages of the project, the governor of Pennsylvania officially designated the Point Park Committee of the Allegheny Conference as the policy making body in matters concerning the development of the Park.

To deal with the many problems and complications arising during the course of this development, we created an interesting device which we call a "co-ordinating committee." It has been very useful here and might also prove useful in other localities. The Point Co-ordinating Committee is composed of representatives of all the public and private interests concerned in this development: the State Highway Department and Department of Forests and Waters, the city and county governments, the Allegheny Conference, the utilities, the engineers, architects, and contractors, etc. Nearly every problem involves two or more of

these interests and can be disposed of expeditiously at the committee meetings where all interests are represented.

However, there is another arm of the Allegheny Conference which is especially concerned with our present subject, namely, the Recreation Conservation and Park Council. Organized in 1949, the Park Council has an executive committee of 18, which meets quarterly or oftener if necessary, and a membership of approximately 200, which assembles at an annual dinner meeting, usually to hear a prominent speaker on park, recreation, or conservation subjects. The Park Council has no paid staff of its own, but occasionally enlists the staff services of the Allegheny Conference and the Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association.

The Park Council works closely with the City Department of Parks and Recreation in a number of ways, but particularly in sponsoring the popular Spring and Fall flower shows at Phipps Conservatory. The Park Council acts as the receiving and disbursing agent for the moneys involved. The shows are free in the daytime, but a fee is charged for the illuminated evening shows. With the funds realized from fees and concessions, the Park Council assists the Conservatory in acquiring rare plants and other unusual expenditures for which there are no regular city appropriations. The funds and income of the former Horticultural Society have also been turned over to the Park Council.

One of the major interests of the Park Council is known as the Slippery Rock-Muddy Creek Area, located 43 miles north of Pittsburgh, and this is my third and final example. It was chosen for its regional significance and because of the growing importance of such outlying parks due to the enormous increase in the use of the private automobile.

The nucleus of the Slippery Rock-Muddy Creek Area is a 132-acre property known as McConnell's Mill. The old mill is located in a picturesque gorge of Slippery Rock Creek, right beside an old covered bridge. The property was acquired in 1944 by the Greater Pittsburgh Parks Association, a private non-profit organization. The Park Council did not wish to become involved in land ownership, so the idea was conceived of revitalizing and enlarging the Greater Pittsburgh Parks Association for this purpose. In March, 1951, the name of the Association was changed to the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, a name which would not connote the paternalism of Pittsburgh and would therefore be more likely to enlist support from the surrounding counties. In this process the Park Council and the Conservancy have become closely affiliated, the latter being the land owning agency.

Shortly after the birth of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, strip-mining, lumbering, and commercialization threatened to destroy the wonderfully scenic Slippery Rock Area adjacent to the McConnell's Mill property, and also the beautiful adjoining valley of Muddy Creek, a tributary of Slippery Rock Creek. To avert this tragedy, it was de-

cided to conduct a fund raising campaign that would enable the Conservancy to purchase several thousand acres in the Slippery Rock-Muddy Creek drainage area. A Pittsburgh foundation made a grant of \$150,000 and the campaign raised over \$100,000 in addition. With these funds the Conservancy has acquired about 1,800 acres in the Slippery Rock valley and has purchased or is in the process of purchasing about 1,500 acres in the Muddy Creek valley. An agreement has been executed whereby the State will purchase the 1,800 acres in the Slippery Rock valley, and the actual transfer of the property is awaiting completion of the title searches. Thus, for \$30,000 the State will acquire an outstanding park site for which the Conservancy paid about \$100,000. However, we are now assured that the site will be permanently preserved, developed, and maintained as a state park. The site possesses numerous recreational and scientific attractions, among which is a potential lake in the Muddy Creek valley. This lake will provide an excellent waterfowl refuge since it is directly in the migration lane from Chesapeake Bay to the Pymatuning swamps. Meanwhile, the Conservancy is proceeding with the purchase of more properties needed to round out the Slippery Rock-Muddy Creek area.

It might also be mentioned that in its brief life to date, the Conservancy has purchased two other important sites in Western Pennsylvania: the Jennings Blazing Star Prairie and Ferncliff Park at historic Ohiopyle—both eminently worthwhile conserving, although for different reasons. The Conservancy's charter limits its membership to 50 persons, from among whom its Board of Directors is elected. At present, there are 45 members and 18 directors. It has no paid officers or staff other than a land purchasing agent and a caretaker at Ohiopyle.

These few examples present only a fragmentary picture of the role of Pittsburgh citizens in the recreation field, but time limitations necessitate selectivity. I can only hope that our experiences may shed some light on the similar problems of others.

Parks Preservation Clinic

HARRY W. ALEXANDER, Harland Bartholomew and Associates,
St. Louis, Mo.

ONE OF THE basic difficulties in preserving parks and public open spaces for their intended uses in any city is the frequent lack of a comprehensive plan which allocates land uses in their appropriate locations. If there is a comprehensive plan which balances and coordinates the various physical features of the community, the chances for conflicts between traffic and other needs and park uses would be minimized. Once having such a plan, it should be made official and its integrity maintained. If adjustments become necessary to meet changing and unforeseen conditions, these adjustments should be made by

the planning commissions as they are in a better position to evaluate the over-all needs of the community than any other public official or agency. Acting in its capacity as a coordinating agency between various officials and departments of the community it should be possible to avoid independent action by various agencies which so often create the difficulties which this panel has been concerned with. The comprehensive plan might reveal that some parks, because of location or other reasons, might be better suited for some other use. The determination of that use, however, should be made by the Planning Commission and shown on the comprehensive plan. It would appear preferable that the agency having jurisdiction over parks should be an independent agency—preferably with metropolitan status. Where conflicts arise between such an independent agency and another public department, the planning commission should be the power making the final decision.

MILO F. CHRISTIANSEN, Superintendent of Recreation, Washington, D. C.

IF I MIGHT be facetious, at least one out of three treatments or cures is possible in the preservation of our parks and open spaces. The first one, of course, is to have someone like Bob Moses as head of the park system. But more seriously, it seems that most of the panel discussants provided solutions to their own problems so there is not much left for the panel consultants to discuss. However, it becomes increasingly obvious that two very important factors are predominant: (1) Have protective legislation and (2) an alerted and aggressive public opinion. The last mentioned item is extremely important as, after all, the consumer public is the one who benefits and the one who is harmed by the withdrawal of open spaces.

In Washington, D. C. we have made a forthright statement on encroachment on parks, playgrounds and recreation areas. We have also contacted every parent-teacher association, citizen and civic associations and many other civic groups putting them on notice in regards to this problem. In many cases, the organizations have taken action supporting the policy statement. Thus it becomes important that every rumor or condition that develops which in any way may infringe upon or eliminate public use of park and recreation space must be guarded against. This is and will continue to be a daily task of vigilance as governmental and population needs expand.

SOME BASIC PRINCIPLES

1. A responsible public authority should prepare a master plan of land use for all public purposes including parks. Such a plan should be projected to the anticipated future growth of the community and revised at frequent intervals to insure adequacy and conformity to chang-

ing standards or developments. (This principle may apply to a metropolis, county, state or nation.)

2. Builders and creators of new subdivisions should be required to reserve a portion of their developments for park and recreation use. Such reservations should be in ratio of size and number to the proposed population of the subdivision and in accordance with accepted standards.

3. Park property should be protected by regulation and law which states that land acquired for park use must be held in perpetuity for that purpose. A park and recreation agency should not be required to release land to other public agencies which did not have the foresight to acquire property for their future needs.

4. Development plans should provide for the various activities intended in park areas; active recreation, the appreciation of nature, and areas for passive recreation.

5. A good public park is an attractive and well-maintained outdoor public area in which people of all ages can enjoy themselves, can be inspired, and can learn. Every effort should be made to improve the quality and diversity of park and recreation activities through a broad educational program to every man, woman, and child in the area.

6. The intangible values of Nature fire our emotions, influence our happiness and contentment, and make life worth living. The naturalistic setting is vital to the development of sound cultural, sociological, and spiritual values. As our Nation progresses to even larger urban areas, it is necessary that man have available a place of natural beauty where the quiet inspiration of a secluded grove creates anew the vigor of mind, spirit, and body. The conservation of natural areas, especially in the midst of metropolitan districts, and their use for recreation is an important factor in the conservation of human ability and the development of the true American way of life.

7. Forecasts have been made that the population of the United States will approximate 300 million. Most communities today are unable to provide adequate parks, playgrounds and open spaces because land has been pre-empted for other purposes.

Park and recreation officials must utilize interested agencies and organizations, and if necessary foster new groups which will: (a) purposely and directly mobilize community effort to be alerted to encroachments for non-park and recreational uses; (b) make or renew effort to interpret and utilize existing park and recreation resources for immediate and future needs; (c) be consciously aware of ever-increasing reduction of work-hour week (labor leaders and economists predict a 30-35 hour work week in the next 10 to 20 years).

8. The National Citizens Planning Conference should urge immediate plans for a workshop, including national leaders from business, industry, government, and the professions, for the purpose of developing national standards or guides to enable the Federal, state, community,

metropolitan, local park and recreation authorities to plan for the immediate and long range needs of the people of the United States.

GEORGE E. DICKIE, Executive Secretary,
Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Recreation, Washington, D. C.

THE reports from the various cities emphasize the growing pressure for the use of park areas for highways, housing, armories, universities, civic centers, schools, hospitals, public parking areas and other purposes. The majority of communities are far below the acreage and proper distribution of that acreage which they should have.

To overcome the pressure for encroachment, a publicity campaign is needed to arouse the community against adverse action and to interpret to the community effectively the true values of parks as against the values for other uses put forth by those who would alienate park land.

Park and recreation areas and other open spaces should be acquired on a basis of a long-range master plan, and when acquired they should be retained because very few cities, if any, have more park acreage than they should have.

To take park land for other purposes to make an immediate budget saving for another department is false economy as it means the repurchase of new park land later at a much greater cost.

If the present pressures for alienation are substantially successful, we will soon face the disappearance of open space from our urban land patterns. This is certainly dangerous and shortsighted.

NEEDS OF OUR GROWING POPULATION

Space for Our Congested Cities

CARL FEISS, AIA, AIP, Planning and Urban Renewal Consultant,
Parks and Open Spaces, Washington, D. C.

THE following hypotheses are postulated without introduction. They will be briefly elaborated, but from the outset it should be made clear that neither peroration or statistics are necessary to support these axiomatic arguments. Unpalatable as some of these hypotheses may be, still, they must form the hard core of the complex plans yet to be designed and a century of programs that are yet to be started. However, I know that responsible and courageous citizens will undertake the arduous and tedious task of rebuilding our worn-out, inefficient, inhuman, and ugly American cities and that they will prevent these cities from backsliding, once we have accomplished even a small portion of our long-range objective.

Here then are the hypotheses:

1. That the central portions of American cities are obsolete, that their continued decay hastens the flight from the city to the suburbs,

and that the rapid and confused expansion of metropolitan areas in no way assists the renewal of the central city.

2. That the loss of value in the central city area is more than a loss in real estate equities or in the value of capital improvements, it is the loss of the heart and brain of urban living.

3. That all evidence points to the curious fact that the more intense the use and the higher the residential and working densities, the more rapid the rate of obsolescence of the central city. This is stated with full acknowledgment of the gigantic construction program now underway in the Grand Central District in New York City. However, I am unaware of any plans for or by the same city to cope with extant congestion or congestion to be created by the pending incredible work densities. Irresponsible self-interest, freewheeling in our unplanned cities has never resulted in guaranteed value nor has it constituted a preventive of obsolescence. Major and *ex-post-facto* surgery such as the new Congress Street Expressway blasted through the huge obsolescence of the south side of the Chicago Loop, is no answer to an historic problem of *laissez-faire*. Under present superficial concepts of regulatory control, such development can easily lead to further exploitation of land and further congestion.

4. That we have neglected the study and development of criteria for adequate planning standards for our urban workers, including our huge daytime white collar population and the employees of industrial and business establishments. We have neglected the development of sound plans for land uses for retail merchandising in central city areas. Further, we have failed to recognize that the customer is human, a pedestrian, and is impacted physically and emotionally by the dangers, appearances, and annoyances of our central business areas. These omissions in our plans assist in the downgrading of the heart of our cities.

5. That the flight to the suburbs is due to a natural human desire to escape to light and air, to individual rather than group choices, to flexibility of movement, and to the amenities of Nature. Further, that the development of planned suburban and regional shopping centers which incorporate these features is satisfying such of these amenities as are now lacking in the central city.

6. That what unplanned decongestion of central cities is now taking place, both in living and working population, creates further in-town blight and obsolescence, expedient land uses, and areas of no-man's-land in which civic anarchy takes place.

7. That since 60 percent of our Nation's population lives in urban places and that conservatively estimating, some 30 million people live in substandard dwelling units and low-grade or depressed areas and since these figures do not include workers' congestion or substandard travel conditions, therefore, the *condition* of our cities and the *degrees*

of the condition of land uses are fundamental planning problems and are neglected concepts in the philosophy of general planning.

8. That congestion takes many forms, all of them bad. That congestion is the converse of adequate space and that adequate space for infinite purposes is a fundamental requirement in our cities. Space is seldom, if ever, available to meet the dynamics of urban development. Therefore, the retention, protection, acquisition and expansion of open spaces for the requirements of flexibility, air, light, quiet, freedom of movement, natural amenity and for space itself, which has its own value, should be as important in our plans as any other land use. At present it is only a minor element in rebuilding plans and renewal concepts.

9. That the requirements of human beings should take precedence over the demands of urban real estate. Space for the general welfare should be a public concept.

10. That the human being is more important than the automobile despite opinions and plans to the contrary.

Now let us make some further and perhaps pleasanter assumptions:

1. That the great experiments in new town planning on open land in Europe and the United States and in particular the Radburn-Greenbelt concepts have set standards and criteria for residential development compatible to the objectives of sound family and group living and in harmony with the technology of our times. The wisdom of these standards has been demonstrated and they are applicable to any location, whether in town or in the suburbs or in new towns. In other words, we have sufficient knowledge to apply such standards to the rebuilding of the central city if we have the imagination and the guts to do so.

2. That if we are to translate our successful experiments with newer planning concepts in peripheral areas to the rebuilding of the central city (which was unfortunately neglected by Ebenezer Howard in his Garden City ideas, just as if a solar system could exist without the sun) it means more parks, recreation space and greenbelts in the central city and even an occasional new Central Park, Washington Mall, or Boston Common. It also means more local recreation spaces for the working population—or at least garden type rest areas at the ground level, below the ground level and on the roofs of buildings.

3. That city planning and the public interest which it is intended to promote, in the foreseeable future, can overcome the pressures of unenlightened self-interest and demonstrate the skills and leadership essential to the renewal of cities.

SPACE CITIES

My children and their peers, the jet propulsion physicists, are deeply concerned with space ships. I am interested in more terrestrial matters—*space cities*. Both are in incubation but more thought seems to be concentrated on the space ships than the cities. The reason is clearly

that it seems more feasible to get away from the congested city by using space ships than it is to create space in those cities.

The *space city* is nothing we have been talking about in our conferences. It is not to be found in our Federal or state or municipal laws. In fact, as a concept it is not even born. I am merely suggesting its conception here. I am suggesting that we use our courage and imagination and dig holes into the piles of masonry we have been building—not for thoroughways, or parking, but for amenity. Let me illustrate.

During the last five years I have been working in Washington in a six-block area, bounded on the south by Lafayette Square, on the east by McPherson Square, on the west by Farragut Square, with K Street on the north. These three squares, part of the original L'Enfant Plan, are surrounded by office buildings with only two residences, including the White House, facing on them. The presence of these squares is a constant source of benefit to the properties adjoining them—not because they enhance property values but because they provide green space and leisure for the workers in the huge office buildings in the area. My office today faces on Lafayette Square and as I prepared this paper I could look down through the trees on the many people who stop for a moment on a park bench, watch the squirrels and pigeons, eat their lunches, read the papers, or converse. It is a very civilized scene and a charming one, with Andrew Jackson astride his prancing horse, gayly doffing his hat to his successors across the street.

I would be happy to be accused of being romantic and sentimental about these green spaces, because I am. There is romance and sentiment needed in the heart of our cities and all the human qualities that go with the moment of leisure and the break in miles and miles of grey stone walls punctured with black holes. That is why the gardens at Rockefeller center are so successful. They are romantic. And so is the garden at the center of the new Lever House on Park Avenue and so is Grant Park in Chicago and the formal Mall in front of the Civic Center at St. Louis, Cleveland, San Francisco, and other places. But what I particularly like about the smaller squares in Washington is that so often they have no importance other than charming space which for my money is more important than anything else, including the formal settings for public buildings.

Of course, I am talking here about downtown business area spaces. I would hope that in time, when non-residential land re-uses are being considered in areas to be cleared of slums and blight, that local plans will require the retention of open spaces for amenity and that Federal write-downs will be predicated on such a sensible land use.

PARKS *vs.* PARKING

It is a sad thing indeed that the words park and parking should be spelled in the same way and be so dissimilar. When I see all the space being created these days for parking and so little for parks, I wonder

whether or not we shouldn't reverse the use of the words, just for fun, and then see what would happen. Not long ago I had the responsibility to review and comment on a large high-rise apartment development. The FHA was requiring for it 80 percent off-street parking. The coverage was 35 percent and the density was somewhere in the vicinity of 110 families per net acre. The buildings were around fourteen stories high. The way the thing worked out in plan, the whole acreage could have been paved in concrete with holes cut in it for the buildings and about a ten foot border of green at the base of the buildings for some scraggly bushes and "Keep Off the Grass" signs. There were no play spaces possible other than the parking areas and the streets, for the several hundred children who are going to live in the project. Yet this is considered a modern residential development and the privies are indoors. In the heated debates I had with other government officials, (debates, incidentally, that I lost), it was clear that neither recreation or amenity could be considered as important as off-street parking. The rent return would be affected. I wonder how important that really is.

AMERICA'S MOST CIVILIZED SQUARE MILE

There is a converse to the above situation which I call America's most civilized square mile. It is within ten minutes of the White House at the northern side of Georgetown. It consists of a series of open spaces joined in a remarkable series of common interests but with different and carefully distinguished uses. At the top of a hill sits Dumbarton Oaks, the handsome mansion in which fine concerts occur. Attached to it is a wonderful little Byzantine Museum, and below and surrounding are some of the most beautiful formal gardens in the country. The Museum and the gardens are open to the public a large part of the year. How many neighborhoods do you know that have their own personal Byzantine Museum in them? Below the formal gardens in a hollow, is Dumbarton Oaks Park, our smallest, most beautiful and least known wilderness National Park. It is open on weekends and holidays only. It has a little stream winding through it and trails into a bird sanctuary. It is a complete escapist paradise—particularly when the daffodils carpet the little valley and the dogwood is in bloom. People stroll about quietly and relax. On the hill east of and adjoining these two open spaces is a good sized public park and playground. This is Montrose Park. It has magnificent trees and rolling lawns down which tumble the children from the Jackson School across the street. No urban public school anywhere has a more beautiful play space. There are picnic tables under the great trees, tennis courts, and a playground and play school for very little children—a kind of children's dream spot. Beyond all this and below is Rock Creek Park and an old cemetery which add to the spacious feeling of the entire area.

The Dumbarton Oaks Square Mile then encompasses the whole range of culture from a wonderful little museum to a wilderness area,

all in one neighborhood in the heart of a great city. This is a very unusual oasis of civilization in our savage, modern city.

I cannot possibly cover here what needs to be said about the requirements of open space for urban living, for schools, for recreation for all age groups and of all types. The sole purpose of this statement is to try and inject in the thinking of the planners and recreation people the idea that space for our congested cities is a fundamental land use as space. With permanent space on hand to be used for the purpose of amenity as well as just air between buildings or storage of cars or other mechanical utilitarian purposes, we may be able to build fine, permanent and beautiful cities out of the rags of our old and worn-out ones. We may, in time, prove that we are able to judge between human and non-human values and make the correct choices. This should be a fundamental objective behind all of our programs of urban renewal.

Advance and Retreat of Metropolitan Park Building

PROFESSOR H. O. WHITEMORE, Chairman,
Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

OUR previous speaker, Mr. Carl Feiss, has outlined the complex problems of space for our congested cities. He has made an able presentation of the increasing and often fierce competition for space, between the primary categories of human activities for which physical provision must be made, and between the individual exponents of enterprise within these primary categories. Among these 9 categories, which are (1) Industry (2) Trade (3) Transportation (4) Residence (5) General Govt. (6) Public Safety, Health and Welfare (7) Education (8) Recreation or Beneficial Use of Leisure Time (9) Religion, the subject of this conference, No. 8 is only one; but it is by no means of lesser importance. In fact, it has a most stimulating and beneficial effect upon all of the other 8.

Now, the primary factor, the one thing we cannot do without in outdoor recreation facilities, sometimes omitted in listing the qualifications, is space, lateral space, vertical space, open space. But this one is also what the exponents of other enterprises have suddenly discovered they need in increasing quantities. A manufacturing corporation, once content with two acres of lot space for one of factory floor space now needs an optimum of 8 acres of lot space for one of factory space. Suburban residences, once on $\frac{1}{8}$ acre lots now require $\frac{3}{8}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ acre or even 1 acre lots. Highways are now widened from 66 feet to 200 feet or more. The new suburban shopping centers have a ratio of up to 235 acres of land to $12\frac{1}{2}$ acres of building space. What seemed like a plethora of space available for recreation is contested for by all of these other facilities, even to demanding that some of the space already

designated for parks be used for other purposes.

So great is this demand and so potent the threat that at the annual meeting of the American Institute of Planners in Kansas City in March, a workshop was set up, with the subject "The Preservation of Public Open Spaces." The panel consisted of Miss Harlean James, of the American Planning & Civic Association; Mr. Donald Bush of Hare & Hare consulting landscape architects for the Kansas City Parks; John Barstow Morrill, Landscape Architect for the Cook County Forest Preserve District; Mr. Charles Jeffers, landscape architect with the Omaha office of the National Park Service, and myself. There were 40 or 50 in attendance representing an important cross section of the planning profession. Many serious cases of the assault upon public parks and open spaces were cited. Eleven questions relative thereto were posed and discussed. I have tried to assemble what seemed to be the consensus of opinion of the assembly and would like to read it to you:

PREFACE. Although it is difficult to document, we are all aware of the contribution of parkways and park systems to promoting a higher level of health, both physical and mental. We know also that they contribute to civic amenity and that, where the people have confidence that parks and reservations are for the most part held in inviolable trust, they have a real impact on the stabilization of property values. Several decades ago we had, in our metropolitan areas, a concept of public open spaces which has all but disappeared from the urban scene. As a result, today open space has virtually no integrity whatsoever. It is to explore the possibilities of revitalizing this critical need that these questions are posed:

1. Should public open spaces be considered as vacant lands subject to a "higher use" if one appears?
A. Public open spaces when being used for a beneficent purpose or held for such use in the *near future*, for uses which require open out-of-door space, must not be considered as vacant land, for there can be no higher use than beneficial out-of-door activities.
2. Under what circumstances should open reservations be subject to military (and restricted) uses?
A. Public land reservations for beneficial out-of-door activities should not be appropriated for military purposes except in a *grave* national emergency, and should be returned in its original condition within one year or less after the emergency is past.
3. Should public buildings be placed in public parks?
A. Only such public buildings as are *necessary* for the fulfillment of the primary purposes of parks, playgrounds and reservations should be permitted. All others should be strictly excluded and should be on their own sites, properly located for ease of public access and use.
4. Should existing public open spaces be appropriated for school buildings?
A. See answer to Question 3. In the new design called park-schools, providing for a close cooperation between park board and school board, the school building and its accessory areas should be *added* to and not *subtracted* from any existing play park to which it will be adjacent.
5. Should fee charging golf courses be parts of public park land?
A. *Public* fee charging golf courses are in harmony with the major purpose of out-of-door recreation area and not to be discouraged, but the area

should be added to and not subtracted from existing landscape parks where people can wander freely and preferably built on independent areas carefully selected for the most effective golf course layout.

6. Should expressways for multiple type traffic be located in existing parkways or through park lands in order to save land and construction costs or to simplify engineering?

A. This is a most serious issue facing our urban people. Admitting the grave necessity of expressways into and through urban areas, they must be located where they will be most *convenient* and *effective*. Cost is definitely a secondary consideration. And shifting location to save a few thousand dollars by using public park land is short sighted and stupid. However, if parks are definitely in the line of the best location, and *no other* location is possible, the park board must be liberally compensated for the loss of valuable park recreation land to enable replacement to be made where most needed. Taking such land without such compensation is reprehensible public management.

7. Should reservoirs for irrigation flood control or power where a heavy draw down occurs in summer be placed in existing city, state and national park lands?

A. Irrigation, flood control or power reservoirs where a heavy draw down occurs should not be located in existing or planned park lands, unless a grave danger exists from floods, or if crop failure is imminent without this storage reservoir, and if no other feasible site can be found. Power reservoirs can be permitted only if a power shortage is present in the community with no other source available, and this only if a draw down of not more than two feet is allowed. In primitive or natural scenic parks, of state or national governments, none of the above can be permitted. Only artificial lakes for recreation use maintained at constant level are permissible in state, county and city landscape parks. In the National Parks, "Any improvement which would in any material way affect the natural scene which the Congress has said 'we are to leave unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations,' " must be avoided.

8. Should so-called port or navigation districts take over lake or harbor fronts in public park lands where private frontage is available without replacing for public use an equal amount of lake frontage within the metropolitan area?

A. No.

9. Should military or veteran's hospitals be considered a higher use than open space parks?

A. No.—Both are important for safety, health and welfare, but a hospital should be in its own specially adapted site, which may overlook, but not be in, public use parkland.

10. Could it be that adequate provision of public open spaces might make expensive public slum clearance unnecessary?

A. No. Because public slum clearance is necessitated primarily by obsolescence of buildings. However, presence of adequate amenity in open playgrounds and green spaces encourages community pride and better maintenance and upkeep, thus retarding obsolescence, and maintaining property values many years beyond the normal period.

11. Should public agencies acquire open spaces in advance of needs in ostensibly growing areas?

A. Yes—definitely. But only in conformity with a definite, well considered plan for recreation areas and among all levels of government, so that the citizens and the courts, if necessary, understand fully the necessity of this advance acquisition. Requiring all new subdivisions to allocate 5—8% of

land for park purposes is not workable unless the urban authorities can accept cash or lands to increase ownership where planned and needed.

Conclusion:

The greatest concern of the common people of the municipality with reference to the above questions is timidity on the part of the park board and its supporters. They must be armed with facts and principles, and sound reasoning and be ready to use these weapons. The people are also concerned that the planning commission or department and officials shall assume responsibility for using *sound judgment* in evaluating claims of projects and activities competing for the use of land and not be dazzled by the size of projects or the power of their supporting groups or agencies.

The questions and answers suggest that we admit we are on the defensive. Another question might be: Are there instances where it might be desirable or necessary to make a strategic retreat. When should we stand our ground on matters of principle and risk total defeat? How can we make a compensating advance while we retreat or face defeat? The answer seems to be to plan large and plan well and advance with boldness and power; refuse to be dazzled by large competing projects or intimidated by financial power of those who profit by these projects or by public officials looking for the easy way out of their space and money difficulties.

Examples of boldness and power in the past are (1) The Boston Metropolitan Parks; The defense of Central Park; The Minneapolis Park System; The Cook County Forest Preserves, Illinois; The East Bay Parks in the San Francisco Bay Region. Recently we have the Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority parks and parkways and the 40,000 acres of state recreation areas in the 5 county Detroit metropolitan region; The Maryland National Capital park and parkway developments, the bold developments in and around New York City; the park-school programme at Grand Rapids, Mich., the recreation area developments on the Tennessee River and its tributaries sponsored by the T.V.A.; the Blue Ridge Parkway sponsored by the National Park Service, and others. You will note, however, that most of these are in the outlying areas and have not fully compensated for the losses or the overcrowding within the cities.

Mr. President, I want to thank you for the opportunity to present these issues.

Town and County Forests

ROLAND F. EISENBEIS, Superintendent of Conservation,
Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Illinois

I COULDN'T help but smile on the day that I was asked to talk on town and county forests. For the assignment was given to one who was born on the plains of North Dakota. A land where a tree became a landmark and where the stealing of a branch, which included a crotch big enough from which to make a sling shot, was cause enough for court

action at the time that the Judge made his next circuit. It wasn't until we left our native State that we realized that many of the existing timber stands were not shelter belts planted back in CCC days, but were part of the natural landscape. However, most of us short grass people have become used to the big plants with the leafy canopy and have great reverence for them.

As a passing thought—have you ever noticed, generally speaking, that communities with large numbers of old trees usually have many churches? The answer must lie with the four freedoms upon which our very early settlements were founded.

Trees, as such, had a great influence on the American way of life. The White Oak provided one of the very earliest forms of revenue for the Americans. The wood was valuable for the shipping industry and the making of whiskey barrels. White and longleaf pine were in great demand as export material. They provided the masts and spars, turpentine and pitch, or naval stores as they were called, for those nations with large and powerful fleets.

As our towns and villages grew, the local timber stands vanished. It is the absence or the limited acreage of forested areas near to our communities that has brought a different kind of value to them. This recent set of values is one of lasting quality and will be invaluable in helping to preserve naturalistic lands for the future if set aside at present.

The speakers that preceded me on the program here today presented excellent pictures of present and future recreational forest needs. The problems of not only a growing but a shifting population, were well covered. It is well established that we can no longer depend on land gifts, from those who pass on, as being sufficient acreage where our people and those of coming generations can find relief or surcease from their toil and their own kind.

It is not important, nor is it profitable, to concern ourselves with the fact that man has established a certain rate of reproduction, succeeded in lowering his death rate, and managed to lengthen his life span, thus increasing greatly the rate of population growth in countries such as ours. However, it is important—it is imperative—that we plan for our total population now and the greater, more urbanized population of the future. This calls for fast bold planning.

The late editor of *Harper's Magazine*, Frederick Lewis Allen, once said:

"If we are to prevent formerly pretty residential areas from succumbing to blight, and the few remaining bits of woodland and pasture from being cluttered with houses for people—who thought they were moving to woodland and pasture—somebody must plan ahead, think big, and plan big. And the first requirement is to set aside, now, large tracts of land where nobody at all may build."

There are a few fine examples in our country where regional or county forests have been established, such as Huron-Clinton Metropolitan

Authority, the Cleveland and Akron metropolitan park systems, and others. These are living examples of what has been done and what should be done in many of our heavily populated areas. However, most of these lack the necessary land acquisition program to care for future needs. Their existence and success has indicated that they are filling, at present, a definite need. I am fairly well acquainted with the programs of each. However, I should like to point out what is being done to fulfill the recreational needs of the second largest city in our country. What has happened to Los Angeles County, since this speech was written, I do not know.

Our own Cook County Forest Preserve has attempted to keep abreast of the population growth that has taken place in the last thirty or more years. In 1929, the total legal allowance of our forest preserves was 35,000 acres. At this same time the population of Cook County, Illinois, was 3,982,000. Since that time the maximum has been increased to 44,000 acres and the population has grown to over 4½ million people. This foresighted, bold acquisition plan has been under the guidance of our General Superintendent, Charles G. Sauers, who has just recently requested that the acreage of the forest preserves be increased to 50,000 acres. The bill is to be considered during the current session of the state legislature.

Fortunately, natural forests, if protected and large enough, maintain their natural beauties and are able to preserve their ecological foundations. Our fundamental consideration is based on the biological adage that says, "Nature left to herself is always orderly." The four and one-half million people of Cook County, which includes Chicago and its 104 suburbs, have over 40,000 acres of such naturalistic lands which bear out this proclamation in spite of the fact that it is the largest and most heavily used reservation of its kind in this country. 80 percent of the land is wild or semi-wild and, of this, 60 percent is forested.

Fundamentally, the Forest Preserve District is not a park, as that term is commonly employed in urban areas, nor is it a group of outer parks. It is a naturalistic reservation and a forested sanctuary throughout, with recreational facilities for appropriate forms of intensive use on the fringes. The interiors have been made and are kept inaccessible except by walking, bicycling, or by horseback riding on the established trails, in order that the bulk of the holdings, as nearly as possible, are maintained in a primitive state.

People are becoming more outdoor-minded. There is a growing interest in natural history and in conservation of our natural resources. There is increasing need and demand for accessible facilities which will enable them to enjoy unregimented voluntary outdoor activities, and the freedom and peacefulness of native landscape. The first need is for space, for elbow room, for freedom from man-made and man-handled environment; where freedom of will and movement meets no interfer-

ence, and where there is a feeling of closeness to the soil—a sense of return to the ancestral state.

The Cook County Forest Preserve lies, roughly, in a great outer belt around the City of Chicago. Many of its holdings are strung out in narrow strips along five major water courses. There is a huge block of 10,000 acres in the Palos Hills—less than an hour's ride from the heart of the city where our greatest wilderness bird, the wild turkey, has found suitable habitation in which to survive.

There are numerous isolated holdings, some large, some small, including several very fine tracts from 1300 to 1700 acres of each. A considerable acreage lies within the corporate limits of the City of Chicago and many of the 104 suburbs that hug each other along the radiating railroads and highways. No matter where you live in Cook County, you can reach some part of the forest preserve in a half-hour drive or less. And at some time, nearly everybody does. For many it is within walking distance. Within several weeks from now, with favorable weather on any weekend, as many as four hundred thousand may come picnicking or to relax in the shade or wander along the trails—and there is ample room for all of them.

The additional six thousand acres that have been requested and are at present under legislative consideration, are to be used for land purchase in the northwestern section of the county. This area will be comparable to the 10,000-acre Palos region we now own in the south. This area includes what might be considered the headwaters to a small waterway that runs through our county. Water is a priceless possession in naturalistic areas. Our boss states that "There is something about water that irons the wrinkles out of a tired mind."

It not only serves as a source of recreation to the countless numbers of fishermen, but the very presence and scenic beauties of such areas are essential to a varying and pleasurable landscape. Then, too, water areas serve as refuges for many kinds of wildlife including the teeming thousands of migratory waterfowl that funnel through Chicagoland.

The distribution of our holdings throughout the county is fairly even and exceptionally close to the city. However, it appears as though city people actually enjoy driving a reasonable distance to the spot selected for their outing. It has been found that they are very willing to drive even fifty miles—one way—as an average distance, for family recreational purposes. This exceeds the distance that Cook County people need to travel to our preserves, but in many States such distances would not be considered excessive.

It is also interesting to note that in two studies recently made by the National Recreation Association on the "Recreation Activities Enjoyed and Desired by Families," that: "Picnicking was found to be the most popular form of recreation outside towns and cities."

Each year our preserves serve over 13 million people who enjoy the

passive forms of recreation. People are left to seek their own enjoyment without any form of organized or regimented recreation being offered. There is a degree of sacredness to be found within naturalistic regions that frowns on using such lands for attractions that are not in harmony with the land. Last year the national forests had more than forty million visitors. The greatest use, by twenty and one-half millions, was for general enjoyment and picnicking.

If we are to follow the evidence of what the majority of people do, throughout the country, it would seem that woodlands and forests are their first preference for recreational purposes.

The facilities wanted by the average family when visiting woodlands are few. Of course, the car, like the telephone, is here to stay, so ample parking must be provided. However, we use parking as a control measure. Our lands are fertile and will absorb considerable pressure. So that a given piece of land is not over used, parking facilities are made available in accordance to the capacity of the area. Much of our Forest Preserve policy is to be found in the principle as stated by Dr. Laurie Cox, which emphasizes that the greatest value of a naturalistic, recreational area is its character of freedom, spaciousness and wild beauty. That there is for every scenic unit, depending upon its character, size and ecology, a very definite point of human saturation beyond which this value and charm are lost, both temporarily when the crowd is present, and permanently because maintenance is unable to make good the scenic damage.

The fact that we are a "green belt" around Chicago means that we find ourselves with 200 miles of highway frontage and about 80 miles of rivers and creeks. Added to this, we have become backdoor neighbors to countless numbers of private property owners. This creates an extraordinary physical situation and many problems of protection and control. However, these are the inevitable considerations when making town or county forests easily accessible to large populations. Then, too, we must provide for tremendous use and at the same time preserve the unspoiled natural features of the environment for enjoyment by the future generations. About 7000 picnic permits are issued each year to groups ranging in number from 25 to 10,000. Groups that are smaller than 25 in number need no permit.

Our solution has been to develop a sufficient number of rather small areas, well placed along the highway borders, for intensive use; and then to maintain exceptionally good protection of the interiors against fire, automobiles and over-use by people. We now have 165 major picnic centers, and countless numbers of smaller ones. Added to these we have 378 of what we call *fixed tables*. These are permanent tables located singly along the roads, for the non-gregarious or family groups. Mass production necessitates massed living and so man, when away from the city, seeks out a place where he and his family can enjoy the spa-

ciousness, freedom and peacefulness of a native landscape. Our policy has been to develop our holdings with first consideration for the family, for this is the greatest common denominator among people.

Winding through our forest areas are the 175 miles of improved trails used by hikers, bicyclists and 30,000 registered equestrians. There are three large outdoor swimming pools which have an annual attendance of 165,000. Our six golf courses handle usually more than 200,000 players.

The heavy use that I have emphasized is largely on weekends and especially on the 17 Sundays and holidays from Memorial Day to Labor Day. Prior to 1947, the picnic centers used to lie virtually idle during the week days. Since that time, through encouragement, the youth group organizations have established the largest Day Camp program in the country, using our facilities. Last year, well over 20,000 children from the city and its suburbs enjoyed Day Camp programs held in the picnic centers of our preserves.

The schools, in the most recent years, are putting the woods to great use as outdoor laboratories, for it is here that many things can be better taught than in the classroom. The varied uses to which town or county forests can be put are unlimited. This, too, must be considered as an intangible value to be had from such holdings, for a forest, in order to be enjoyed, and to gain and hold respect, must represent something that cannot be had or enjoyed in the city.

To hundreds of thousands lacking transportation, money or opportunity to visit even the nearby state parks, these forest areas are a Godsend. City or county forests, as naturalistic areas, have a definite function and a specific place between the small city park on one hand and the large wilderness areas on the other. Their intrinsic values lie in the cultural factors that they bring to the neighboring communities and people. It is important that man:

"Makes rules for the preservation of natural beauty. Unless he protects it even at the partial expense of some of his other greedy activities, he will cut off his descendants, a helpless prey forever, to the base materialism of mean and vulgar sights. Destruction walks by noonday. Unless we reverse the engines and, instead of speeding up destruction, plan the development of the country so that the minimum of harm can be done to nature and to beauty, the future of our race, whatever its social, economic and political structure may be, will be brutish and shorn of real value."

Discussion

EARL VON STORCH, Deputy Director, Planning and Engineering Branch,
Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency

THE three speakers we have just heard have raised many challenging points. In fact, the substance of their papers will require some digestion and considerable thought before their full implication

can be grasped. The time we have left for discussion can hardly produce an adequate response, so therefore I hope that the papers will be given their proper attention when published in the proceedings of this conference and that the ideas and problems presented can be taken up again at future conferences.

"While I am sure that the papers were prepared without advance collaboration, no one can question the fact that we have here a close interrelationship of ideas. Mr. Feiss, in his proposal for a space city, has advanced some revolutionary ideas on the amount and type of open space we should have in our central areas and has raised sights with respect to open spaces in the areas beyond. His concepts and our reactions to them are of particular and immediate significance in connection with planning for urban renewal and rebuilding, which will largely focus on the rebuilding of central areas and the restoration and preservation of built-up residential areas wherever they might lie. Professor Whittemore has not only indicated ways in which our sights might be raised but has also emphasized the problem of protecting and retaining such open space as our cities have been able to establish. Mr. Eisenbeis has carried the discussion to the outer parts of our urbanized areas, thus setting the wide panorama which must be kept in view as we think of open space for a growing urban population.

"It seems to me that the rich fare we have just been given calls for treatment in three ways. First, it indicates the need for a new and fresh look at the type of city we think we should have and the function of open space in it. It indicates that there is still plenty of room for new thinking in setting our planning objectives and goals. Second, as we re-think our planning objectives and goals, we will need to take a hard look at the plans themselves, at their adequacy and at what needs to be done to carry them out. Third, and this is really the tough one, is action to get the open spaces we need and then, once gotten, to keep them. As Professor Whittemore has pointed out, this 'keeping' is a real and not an imaginary problem.

"Now, with only a few minutes left, I know that we can hardly get into questions of the type I have indicated or others which you in the audience have in mind, so once again I suggest that these papers be the subject of your very serious consideration after this conference is over."

I have said nothing about points raised during discussion because the prepared statement Perry Norton made during the discussion period took up so much time and, according to my notes and my memory, there was nothing else of significance to report. If, as you had previously planned, Perry's paper is published in full, it might be prefaced by a statement that, while it was presented at this meeting because it fitted in with the topic at hand, it was intended to reply to matters that had been raised at several other sessions of the conference.

PERRY L. NORTON, Executive Director,
American Institute of Planners, Cambridge, Massachusetts

IF I HAD tried to say the things six years ago that I am about to say now, I might not be here today because Professor Whittemore might have flunked me and I could have ended up being a surveyor. Most of the talk thus far has been in terms of quantities. There has been more or less unchallenged assumption that parks are necessary—and I am using the word parks here to mean open spaces in the broad senses which you use here.

It seems to be a fairly safe bet to conclude from what has been said that, if in 1940 we had X number of people and in 1955 we have 10X number of people, we now need *ipso facto* 10 times the amount of public open space as was available to our urban populations in 1910. Oh yes, there are modifications to this too simple formula, but they are only modifications. No one is giving much attention to the why of the needs for open spaces. Specifically what are we trying to accomplish for society in the preservation and development of these open spaces? We have only the quantitative approach (with apologies to Carl Feiss's sentimental attachment to Washington's squares and Dumbarton Oaks) and this is the worst kind. In other societal problems we have begun to learn something of critical needs. In terms of job-status and occupational characteristics we begin to see what motivates people to behave as they do. In terms of the power structure in the community we begin to see patterns which we have heretofore only suspected. But in terms of leisure-time activities, we have been doing a lot of loose thinking. We know there is a distinct relationship between the do-it-yourself activities of the father of the family and the cultural need for an identification of the father role. But we have not yet translated this relationship into a re-examination of the artifacts of leisure-time activities.

We say that we need parks and playgrounds and picnics grounds and camping grounds, and a whole host of areas and then if someone asks us why we need these activities we become righteously angry and we sputter out such comments as:

Relaxation from the crushing concrete canyons of the city
Education, to become more humble through life processes and
Lewis Mumford might add, to participate in these life processes.

I submit to you that these are not adequate expressions of the needs for open space. Is it for relaxation, for specific kinds of physical exercise, for identification with the soil in a world torn asunder through technological advances, for personal communication with Nature—is it for any of these things that we seek to provide the artifacts? How can we be so sure that the facilities we have been providing thus far are the facilities that we now need to meet these objectives? Professor Whittemore asked this same question.

Yesterday, Mr. Grady Clay made a very important observation, which should have started some wheels turning. He said that buyers of one-family homes bought a piece of open space. Think about that a moment. In recent years there have been literally millions of persons who have heretofore lived in congested urban apartments who are now owners of one-family houses with plots of green which are their own pride and responsibility. Carl Feiss refers to the flight to the suburbs. You may say that subdivisions have been devouring the countryside . . . I say that millions of people have achieved something of a goal through acquiring a piece of land. This movement has real significance to us in terms of the quantity and quality of our public open spaces. Who will picnic in a public park when he has a private park in his own back yard? Who will spend much time admiring public gardens when he has a horticultural project of his own going on in his garden? What man will feel the need for camping when he has a fistful of work to accomplish in his own backyard?

We have talked here of increasing leisure time. True, work-hours per job have been reduced during the years from 60 to 50 to 40 hours. True also that the 30-hour week is on the horizon. But the number of jobs have increased. More people have two jobs and the number of women who are taking on jobs outside of the family may be increasing. All this looms as a factor not part of our cultural patterns of 40 years ago.

Someone here has said that we must think in terms of the automobile (certainly not an original statement); but how incredibly slow we have been in recognizing the automobile in terms of park systems. Michigan has quite a thorough system of tourist roadside parks, a device which makes sense to a lot of Michigan motorists.

The Sunday ride is a recreation activity and maybe we need no more reason than this to preserve vast areas of forests and lakes and countryside. The psychological impact of being able to say with feeling: "These hills, forests, this green magnificence, this is my own, my native land."

But I think that you must keep evaluating the *why* of things. If you can tell city planners what social, cultural and psychological needs are served through the preservation and development of open spaces, then you will furnish these planners with the same sort of information and pressure that have been provided for other needs.

I beg of you not to accept purely quantitative evaluations of the need for open spaces. Give us the *why* and we will try to give you the *wherewithal*. You have heard from enough planners here to be quite certain that the planner will look upon public open spaces as one of several kinds of land uses. If you are self-critical of your demands you will be most sure of your grounds for justifying public open spaces.

Central Park, New York

STUART CONSTABLE, Executive Officer,
Department of Parks, New York City

THE Central Park is not now in any danger of invasion by improper uses or of reduction in area; in fact, it is in no danger of any sort.

It enjoys the protection of public opinion—the Press, the Park Association and Commissioner Moses.

The entire park system in New York is safe from invasion and from reduction in area. It is being increased at every opportunity. Since 1934 the number of playgrounds in New York has increased from 114 to 640, and the park acreage from 14,827 to 27,057 acres.

All park areas are inalienable. In order to use park land for any other purpose, the Commissioner must surrender the land to the Board of Estimate; thereafter a demapping proceeding and a local law removing the park trust must be passed by the Council.

All this takes so long that any diversion or any proposed diversion of park land is well advertised long before the event and public opinion led by the Park Association can easily save the park land if the proposed diversion is improper.

Central Park has withstood a long series of attempts to use it for something other than a park.

From the records it is evident that since Central Park was first founded the proposed invasions of the park could be numbered in the hundreds. But the city fathers who conceived the park, Frederick Olmstead and Calvert Vaux who designed and built it, Samuel Parsons, Superintendent for many years, and Robert Moses have all effectively preserved this great park for the people of New York.

An early threat was that of a proposed World's Fair in 1893. Several foreign world's fairs had been resounding successes and the United States hoped to emulate them. New York wanted the fair and naturally everyone looked at good old Central Park, with plans for ripping up tremendous areas, roofing over the reservoir, etc. etc., but it was saved, partly by chance and partly by the strong opposition of Andrew H. Green, Boss Thomas Platt and Charles A. Dana. The Mayor and all the Park Commissioners were for using the park but the struggle fortunately ended when Chicago outbid New York at Washington and got the necessary votes in Congress. It was a close call.

The average attack on Central Park, is easily repulsed through sheer non-action. Since the proponent of any invasion must have the approval of the Park Department and the City, it is only through some special pressure that any of the radical schemes near accomplishment, such as cited in the World's Fair case. In the administrations since reorganization in 1934, such a situation rarely arises, and although there have been schemes presented, they don't get very far. Throughout its history

the defense of Central Park has been ably handled by strong men, the press and public opinion.

Following are some of the more important cases:

In 1886 at the death of General Grant, New York practically gave the family a free choice of any site in the City. Samuel Parsons was able to keep the tomb out of Central Park only by way of subtle suggestion.

At one time a map was actually published by Theodore Roosevelt's uncle and others proposing selling the lower half of the park for building lots and acquiring more land farther north. This scheme got nowhere.

In the late nineteenth century, another idea, complete with drawings and pictures was presented for a grand boulevard, or Rotten Row, along Fifth Avenue, slicing a nice chunk out of the park, but public opinion overcame it.

One specially interesting incident which almost won out was a proposed race track on the west side of the park. Fast horses were fashionable at that time and the social leaders actually got a bill through Albany authorizing the City to build a track in the park. In this case opposition came from the press, the public and associations of various kinds. Even the Park Commissioners were for the track. Then public storm warnings appeared and physical violence was threatened on the laborers at the track. The acquiescent city government abruptly changed its mind and the same senator who had helped pass the original bill was sent to Albany to secure its repeal. This was a clear case of public opinion winning the fight. It is interesting to note that the Harlem River Speedway was developed after this and there also a battle took place. The horse people did not want a pedestrian promenade along the water, the public did. The promenade was eventually added. As late as 1918 some people were proposing a race track around the reservoir in the center of Central Park.

Several other situations can be cited, such as the proposed Heine Statue, which fortunately ended up in the South Bronx; the creation of a Zoological Park north of the reservoir, which also was defeated. It is interesting to note that the Zoological Park and Botanical Garden eventually occupied most of Bronx Park, the Central Park of the Bronx. Reverse procedure seems to have obtained in the Menagerie at 64th Street. Public opinion would not let it be removed from the park.

The Sherman Statue now at 59th Street was originally proposed for the end of the Mall with complete reconstruction of about three acres of the area to be dominated by a great equestrian statue. In this case Mr. Parsons seems to have kept it out of the park and placed it where it now is by argument.

On one occasion the power of the press was boldly used to effectively stop an invasion. A plan had been prepared to make a plaza at 59th Street and 8th Avenue, which would require reconstruction of a large

section of the park and cutting of many trees. The Commissioners agreed to the work, against Mr. Parsons' viewpoint. He was directed to proceed, which he did, but behind their backs approached the *New York Sun*, whose editor wrote a sarcastic article ridiculing the whole plan. Work was quietly stopped and the whole thing forgotten.

In 1941 a plan was proposed to create an eight acre plaza of South America within the park at 81st to 86th Streets. The proponent tried to forward his case by a long detailed letter to Nelson Rockefeller, Director of South American affairs. It was effectively squashed by a typical Moses letter with his unqualified disapproval and opposition.

A perennial later day attack on Central Park stems from our present traffic problem which can be solved by carving an underground garage in the park. This is a comparatively easy suggestion to knock down, both from the viewpoint of damage to Central Park and that underground Manhattan is solid rock.

I should like to read the correspondence referred to concerning the Plaza of South American Heroes.

Law Offices
JOHN T. HETTRICK
N. Y. C.

Residence
60 West 70th Street
Hon. Robert Moses,
Park Commissioner
New York City

February 6, 1941

Dear Sir:

After an interview with Mr. Constable of the engineering force of the Department of Parks, I take the liberty of attaching a copy of a letter sent to Nelson Rockefeller as "Director of Cultural Relations between the Americas."

This letter was also submitted by me to Hon. A. A. Berle, Jr., Asst. Secretary of State in Washington. Information was returned to me that before the State Department would give the plan official consideration it would have to be approved by you as Park Commissioner. I was told that the plan had received favorable unofficial consideration.

I propose to mail several small artistic pamphlets by the thousands without any names being used. This work to be done under the supervision of a small "Temporary and Unofficial Committee" at our own expense. The pamphlet will be entitled "PROPOSED LATIN-AMERICAN 'HALL OF FAME' IN CENTRAL PARK." If enough interest is shown by the officials of the 22 South American countries and in this country the way would be open to form official committees to carry on the work. If you approve I will see that your letter is broadcast to the countries interested and printed in fac-simile for general distribution.

Very truly yours,
(signed) JOHN T. HETTRICK

JOHN T. HETTRICK
60 West 70th Street
New York City

February 11, 1941

Nelson Rockefeller, Esq.,
Director of Cultural and Commercial
Relations between the Americas,
Rockefeller Center, N. Y. City.

Dear Sir:

Your work in this field may mark the path of peace between all the nations of the two continents of the Western Hemisphere lasting for a century.

May I offer a suggestion which may be helpful to you in this vast undertaking?

In the section of Central Park from 81st to 86th Street on the West side, there is a plot of about eight acres, dominated by the impressive equestrian statue of Simon Bolivar, Liberator of several South American countries. It would be feasible to establish a Sud American "Hall of Fame"—"Hill of Fame"—"Colinade de Fama" or "Sala de Fama." All the republics of Central and South America to be asked to participate with the people of the United States in placing memorials, statues, or busts of the great personages who, from the days of Balboa and Magellan, have struggled for the liberty of their peoples.

About thirty years after the close of our Revolutionary War there was begun the struggle of the peoples in the Southern Continent for independence. There arose great patriots, statesmen and war generals about whom very little is known by the general public of this country. To bring the history of the heroes of South America before our people in a graphic manner would stimulate the youth and all of our citizens to the value of liberty and democracy for which other people besides ourselves have struggled.

The cost of the memorials and statues would be small when divided between the 22 countries to the South. I am convinced that many citizens of the United States would subscribe the comparatively small sums needed for our part in this work. Any needed landscaping would not be expensive, as the rocky height and surroundings form a natural and impressive site for this purpose. Improvements to the grounds and foundations might be made a W.P.A. project. In many of the capitals of South America are noble monuments to national heroes, and replicas of some of these might be used.

An advantage of this site is that the imposing New York State Memorial Building to President Theodore Roosevelt is just south and also the Museum of Natural History, the largest institution of its kind in the world, to which hundreds of thousands are attracted every year. Visitors would naturally be attracted to this South American Memorial on the rocky hill just north. It might please our "Good Neighbors" to know that thousands of our school children from the public schools would visit the place and become acquainted with the history of their countries.

ORGANIZATION AND PRELIMINARY WORK

The cooperation of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State would be necessary at the outset. Communications to the rulers of the South and Central American countries would follow. Committees of citizens of the U.S.A. and countries which may become interested, could be organized to work with the ambassadors, ministers, counsels and other officials of our neighbors. Architects, sculptors, and artists would become interested and many

would volunteer their services for the preliminary work. Similar professional men and citizens of South America would be attracted to the project.

After the preliminary work it would be fitting to have a combined celebration of all interested at a DEDICATION OF THE SITE, to be held, say on July 4, 1941. The display could be made a most colorful pageant of international importance. Speeches would show the solidarity of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to keep their freedom and democracy without interference by the totalitarian powers of Europe. President Roosevelt might decide that it was a fitting time to broadcast to the peoples of the U.S.A. and South America and by short wave all over the world the importance of the event.

A showing of the naval, army, air and other arms of the international defense of the Western Hemisphere might be approved by the U.S.A. and other governments. The parade of even small detachments from all of the 22 countries to the South would be a demonstration of our unity and strength and would hearten the peoples of every country in the world except the Axis powers of Germany, Japan and Italy—and before July 4, 1941, the Axis powers may be reduced to two.

"LIBERATORS AND HEROES OF SOUTH AMERICA"

That there is no shortage of famous personages is shown by a book just published with the above title.

The following is from a critique of this volume published in the Book Review of the New York TIMES on February 9, 1941:—

"There is the forerunner of independence, Miranda of Venezuela; San Martin, who saved Chile; Moreno, champion of free speech in Argentina; Artigas, "protector of free people" in Uruguay; Gen. Belgrano, the patriotic soldier; Bernardo O'Higgins, the "supreme director" of Chile; Paez, "the man on horseback" and at some length the career of the great Simon Bolivar. There are Sucre and Santander, the young patriot martyr Tiradentes; Bonifacio, the father of Brazilian independence; Dom Pedro, the first and the second; Unanue of Peru and Sarmiento, the school-master President of Argentina."

The above and with Balboa, the first European to sight the Pacific Ocean from a height in Central America, and Magellan, the first human to organize an expedition which circumnavigated the world, may be added to the list of heroes of South and Central America. The great sculptors and artists of our modern times could make this "Hall of Fame" as famous in the centuries to come as the immortal works of Athens and Rome. The effect on the "cultural relations between the Americas" can hardly be conceived.

As an after-thought it occurred to me that our more than competent Park Commissioner, Robert Moses, who would have control over such a project, might object to the erection of buildings; but surely he could not object to colonnades, pergolas and memorials of artistic merit which would enhance the beauty of one of the rare spots in Central Park.

If this plan meets with your approval I would be pleased to do the necessary work in the publicity and secretarial field, in my leisure time, without compensation.

Wishing you every success in your great international undertaking, I remain,

Respectfully yours,
(signed) J. T. H.

City of New York
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS
Arsenal, Central Park

March 7, 1941

John Hettrick, Esq.,
60 West 70th Street,
New York City, New York.

Dear Sir:

Your grandiose scheme to fill up part of Central Park with assorted memorials, has my unqualified disapproval and opposition, and I hope you will drop the matter without creating unnecessary trouble. This letter is written you under the provisions of the City Charter which places upon the Park Commissioner initial responsibility for approving or disapproving memorials in parks.

Central Park, as its name implies, is a comparatively small recreation space in the very center of Manhattan, serving a vast number of people of all kinds and ages. It already has too many buildings and structures in it, not appropriate or desirable in a park of this kind.

We have fortunately a fine memorial to Bolivar which symbolizes all the things you refer to in your letter. If you had proposed to improve the surroundings of the Bolivar Monument so as to give it a better setting, and to afford better access and public accommodations, I would have no quarrel with you, but even such a thing would have to be done with the greatest restraint. I therefore urge that you drop this promotion scheme.

Copies of this letter are being sent to Adolf Berle and Nelson Rockefeller, and of course, to the Mayor.

(signed) Very truly yours,
ROBERT MOSES
Commissioner.

So long as there are dedicated public servants like Robert Moses the parks in New York are in no danger. However, through the years it has been intelligently guided public sentiment which has kept the Central Park for the people.

There will be many future suggestions that park lands be diverted to other uses. Selfish interests will always try to find a way to divert public property to private use, and misguided proponents of public economy will always see in park lands ideal school, hospital, library, incinerator and sewerage disposal plant sites.

Our fervent hope in New York is that our parks will be as well protected in the future as they have been for the past twenty-one years.

Our Perpetual (?) Temporaries

RUDOLPH KAUFFMAN II, Assistant to the Managing Editor, *The Evening Star*.

TWO weeks ago yesterday the Capital of the United States and the rest of the world celebrated the 10th anniversary of VE Day.

If it sounds like vain provincialism to put Washington and all other places in that order, it stems from an understandable pride in this beautiful city where I was born and where I've worked for a newspaper that has grown with the city for more than a century.

In the 10 years that have passed since Germany laid down her arms in World War II there have been many changes in Washington. There are more people. There are more and better schools, there are more and better roads, bridges, stores, trees and playgrounds. The average home is a better one. The average individual lives a fuller life. Almost anyone would have to admit that we have progressed.

There is one thing, however, that hasn't changed—the unsightly, cheap, expensive to maintain, sweltering, inefficient temporary buildings that the necessities of two world wars have left with us, that prevent the fulfillment of a half century of painstaking effort and expenditure to provide a fitting setting for the principal buildings of our Government and the fine memorials that have been erected to commemorate its great men and achievements.

Of the 75 “tempo” built in World Wars I and II, 54 remain. Fifty of those remaining were built in the second war. Only 4 remain of the 24 that cluttered the Mall, Union Station Plaza and other areas when the November 11, 1918 Armistice was signed.

Of the 54 “tempo” still here, 30 may be said to be in key park areas—the areas designed to provide the setting for the heart of our Government. I speak of those on Constitution and Pennsylvania avenues, on the Mall and in West Potomac Park. The other 24 are scattered in areas where they are perhaps somewhat less objectionable.

I won't dwell at length on why they are objectionable. I think we're pretty well aware of the reasons.

1. They wall in the Reflecting Pool on both sides and interpose themselves between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial, occupying what is intended to be one great park setting for these two beautiful and inspiring structures that all America travels here to see.

2. To all intents and purposes they completely preempt West Potomac Park.

3. They scar marginal areas of the Mall between the Capitol and the Monument.

4. They are more expensive to maintain than permanent structures. Being flimsy and temporary, they require excessive cleaning and painting. Some of the older ones have had to have new foundations.

5. They provide an extremely inefficient place in which to work. For example, 21,513 man hours of Government work were sacrificed in the summer of 1954 because the heat became insufferable and employes were let off, not to mention the work loss on days not quite hot enough for employes to be let off.

I doubt if you could find anyone who thinks this is right, or anyone who wouldn't immediately say he thought they ought to come down.

No successful private industry would think of trying to get good work out of its office employes in such surroundings.

When plans were laid for building *tempos* during World War II, President Franklin Roosevelt said that he hoped they would be so designed that they would fall down in five years.

They haven't fallen down, of course, and only one of those Mr. Roosevelt was talking about has been torn down.

Fair questions to ask are: "Why hasn't something been done? What can be done to rid our Capital City of these eyesores?"

I said a moment ago that 20 of the 24 World War I "*tempos*" have disappeared. They disappeared, as many of you no doubt know, in the period between the wars. Before I attempt to answer the questions I've just asked, I'd like to go back to the 20's and 30's and take a look at how we were able to accomplish their demolition then; because what we want to accomplish now was accomplished, broadly speaking, then.

There were four major factors which helped set things to right after World War I:

1. A 48% decrease in Federal employment in Washington in the 10 years following the 1918 Armistice. Employment in the 10 years since VE Day has dropped only 15 percent.

2. The Federal Triangle Project, conceived originally by the Mac-Millan Commission of 1901, revived in the early 1920's and authorized by Act of Congress on May 25, 1926, which set the stage for new permanent buildings to house Federal employes.

3. The Depression of the 1930's which spawned the public works programs that carried the Triangle to completion plus additional buildings to meet the needs of new and expanding Government agencies.

4. Aggressive leadership on the part of successive Presidents and Congressional leaders.

Many of you are familiar with what took place; the moves that gave us modern Washington.

In the first place demolition of "*tempos*" was provided for in the regular appropriations bills.

Men like Frederic A. Delano, Charles Moore, U. S. Grant III, Senator Smoot of Utah, Andrew Mellon, David Lynn, David E. Finley, Louis A. Simon, George A. Von Nerta and James A. Wetmore and many others, having revived the idea of a permanent building program,

wrapped the idea up in red ribbon as a program with a clearly recognizable master plan and theme and put it across.

In his message to Congress dated December 9, 1925, President Coolidge explained that no building designed primarily for the Executive Branch had been constructed for 40 years and asked for an annual appropriation of \$10,000,000 for a building program later described by the National Commission of Fine Arts as "more ambitious than any ever undertaken by the Government since Congress provided for the location of the National Capital on the banks of the Potomac."

Secretary of the Treasury Mellon is credited with playing the major role in selling the idea of the Federal Triangle to President Coolidge. He brought together a Board of Architectural Consultants to work out the broad aspects of the Triangle plan. He paid for a motion picture which was used to demonstrate to members of Congress how the Triangle would look. Mr. Finley wrote the scenario. It was called "The City of Washington."

Shortly after the election of President Hoover, Mr. Mellon was host to an audience of notables at the United States Chamber of Commerce. The President, Congressional leaders and members of the Cabinet were there.

So great was the demand for tickets to this function that it was repeated the following evening.

The plan was sold.

As support for properly housing the Government and providing it with a proper setting grew, Congress passed on March 4, 1929, an act to enlarge the Capitol grounds as far as Union Station Plaza. This program, carried out by David Lynn, architect of the Capitol, rang down the curtain on the "tempos" that littered the Union Station Plaza area following the first World War.

On top of these steps, which got the program fairly underway, came depression-born Public Works. More buildings—South Interior, the present State Department, the Federal Reserve Building, the Social Security Building and others were added.

These projects, taken together, remade the face of Washington's Federal Area. The long sought goal of seeing the Mall and Potomac Park cleared for park development was in sight when the Nation found it must gird for war again. Then a whole new crop of "tempos" sprouted in which future Federal employes would be doomed to swelter inefficiently where grass, trees and inspiring vistas and reflections are supposed to be.

Now, let's take a look at the record in the ten years following VE Day.

We started off fine. We started off in high gear. Even while the fighting was still in progress finishing touches were being put to an omnibus public buildings bill aimed at carrying forward the work of the years between the wars, at eliminating the "tempos" and excessive rental of

private office space and at providing (if needed) a shelf load of public works in case post-war depression materialized.

H.R. 4276, 79th Congress, the bill in question, called for the authorization of a long-range building program estimated at nearly a billion dollars for the entire Nation, nearly \$200,000,000 of it in the Capital.

Here are some of the buildings it would have authorized: a New Navy Department, completion of the new War Department (now the State Department), a new building for the FBI, a new service building to house the housekeeping functions of Government, new buildings for the Smithsonian Institution and a new Federal Courthouse.

If this bill had been passed and followed by regular appropriations, as happened in the case of the building bills of the 20's and 30's, there would be fewer "tempos" to plague us today.

It didn't pass, however. It never got out of committee.

The primary reason for this was political. Members of Congress reasoned, and probably rightly, that even to authorize nearly a billion dollars worth of buildings at a time when there was a shortage of building material, labor, homes for veterans, and offices and plants for business and industry would be an action that would be used against them in the 1946 Congressional elections.

So, the "tempos" stayed on.

In the fall of 1945, when hearings were held on this bill, the Government was renting 7,000,000 square feet of privately owned office space in Washington. There actually was a shortage of private office space as a result.

A hue and cry went up. The government was under pressure. As soon as any slack appeared in Federal employment here, it released the rented space. It did it by shifting employes into "tempos," making it doubly certain that they could not be demolished.

As of April 30 last, the Government was renting 1,206,723 square feet of privately owned office space in Washington. So, you can see that its policy of giving up rental space has been highly successful. It is now renting less private office space in Washington than it has at any time in the last 28 years.

The 1945 omnibus buildings bill that I mentioned a few moments ago was geared to an estimated permanent Federal payroll in Washington of 180,000 employes by 1950. It was a very conservative bill.

Actually, of course, the figure never got that low. As of June 30, 1945, there were 264,770 Federal employes in Washington. The figure now, as the fiscal year 1955 draws to a close, is 228,194, a reduction of only 15 percent compared with a 48 percent reduction in the ten years following World War I.

So that even if all the buildings that might have been built under the authority of the 1945 bill had since been built, there would still be "tempos" in use.

When the omnibus bill of 1945 failed, the problem was attacked piecemeal. As a matter of fact, it still is being attacked piecemeal. We finally got a desperately needed new Government Accounting Office building and a new Federal Courthouse under separate "one-shot" bills.

The "Tempos" meanwhile became more and more permanent.

Then, just as it appeared the conditions for approval of a master building plan were slightly more favorable, came the Cold War, bigger and better A and H bombs and the Korean conflict.

The result has been tremendous defense appropriations which, by the way, include millions spent for permanent buildings overseas both for this country and others that have forced otherwise legitimate requests out of the budget, and foot dragging occasioned by repeated suggestions that the Government disperse to a safe distance from Washington.

Until quite recently new permanent Federal buildings for Washington have had very low priority and the "tempos" have gone on, and on and on.

I think that answers my first question: "Why hasn't something been done?" On second thought, it really isn't an answer. It's an alibi.

To the second question: "What can be done to rid our Capital City of these Eyesores?"—there are some partial answers in the making.

Leading the list is lease-purchase legislation, which, adapted to meet the special needs of Washington by Representatives Auchincloss and Buckley and Senator Chavez, would clear the way for new public buildings to be lease-purchased in Washington's Southwest Redevelopment area, and makes it mandatory that approximately equivalent "tempo" building space be demolished. This legislation has received Senate sub-committee approval.

Then there are three separate bills (piecemeal legislation again) before Congress—one to build a headquarters for the Atomic Energy Commission, another to build a new building for the Smithsonian Institution and a third to build a headquarters for the Central Intelligence Agency, the last being a leading user of "tempos."

There's a bill, sponsored by Representative Broyhill of Virginia that would establish a "Commission for the Removal of Temporary Government Buildings in the District of Columbia."

There's still another bill, sponsored by Senator Butler and Representative Miller, both of Maryland, that would (1) demolish "tempos" and (2) replace the space with permanent buildings in Maryland.

Taken in its entirety this buildings legislation is pretty palid compared with that which was in the works ten years after World War I.

Of the lot the so-called Auchincloss Bill seems to have the best chance of alleviating the "tempo" situation.

The real answer to my second question, it seems to me, lies in trying somehow to follow the pattern of the 20's, the pattern of the 1945 proposal which died a-borning, and to follow it despite the Cold War.

We're being told, and I'm sure it's so, that we have to face a future in which we must stand permanently armed by means of continuing large defense budgets. Let's face it. There just isn't going to come a time when we can slump back into small budgets that can conveniently take care of such things as permanent buildings for Government.

It seems to me that we must turn to this pattern of buildings programming despite the need for budget balancing—after all short term economy on buildings now will simply result in an expensive accounting at some future date. We must do it despite rumors of dispersal, which when pinned down with official sources amount to little more than plans to locate small nuclei of key war agencies outside Washington; despite wishful thinking that by some magical process the Federal Government will shrink back into its present permanent buildings at some unspecified time in the future.

As I see it there should be a single overall Executive Branch building program to include both lease-purchase and outright building and provide for the mandatory demolition of "tempo." It should be agreed upon at the highest level after everyone concerned has ironed out the details. It should be drafted into legislative form to serve as a continuing blueprint for housing the Government and should be put in the form of an authorization, to be followed by a program of appropriations based on agreed upon priorities.

It seems to me this would be something the President could present as the considered policy on buildings of the Executive Branch, something everyone could get behind and push.

I used to cover the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, now the National Capital Planning Commission, for *The Star*. In one of the back rooms of the Commission's offices there used to hang on the wall some words to live by—words spoken once by Daniel Burham, who needs no introduction to this group. With your permission I'd like to read the text of it. It's not long, but it's very much to the point in any discussion of "tempo."

"Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood, and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever growing insistency. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order and your beacon beauty."

Nearby, some wit had posted a fake Latin inscription: "Soc et tuum."

Our leaders are preoccupied with matters that are literally of earth shaking importance. But, I think that they would take time out, just as did the leaders of the somewhat less hectic 20's, to put across a really well-considered long range program that replaced a piecemeal approach.

With such a program to rally around I sincerely believe we could take Washington's "tempos" and "Soc et tuum."

A year or so ago the Perpetual Building and Loan Association here built a new building outside their old building, while construction of the new one was going on, they put a sign which said, I'm sure inadvertently,—“Temporary Perpetual Building and Loan Association.”

They got kidded about it, of course.

But I'm wondering if they weren't saying the right thing after all. They were making something temporary out of something perpetual.

I hope and trust, and I know you do too, that our Government isn't doing the reverse.

Zoning Round Table

Tuesday, May 25, 1955

PANEL: Chairman: Flavel Shurtleff, Counsel, American Planning and Civic Association.

MEMBERS: Malcolm H. Dill, Director Baltimore County Planning Commission, Towson, Md.

John Nolen, Jr., Director, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Brysis N. Whitnall, Planning Consultant, Los Angeles, Calif.

Garland A. Wood, City Planner, City Planning Commission, Richmond, Va.

REPORTER: Dr. Dorothy A. Muncy, Consulting Industrial Planner, Washington, D. C.

PARK REQUIREMENTS IN SUBDIVISIONS

SEVERAL methods available to planners in providing open space within new residential subdivisions were discussed by the panel: reservation, dedication and lot fee charged to the subdivider.

Mrs. Whitnall described the fee method now being employed by Southern California communities. The city receives a fee per lot from the subdivider. Sites for future parks and recreation purchased with the funds are selected in localities designated on the master plan of parks and recreation. A major advantage of this method, Mrs. Whitnall pointed out, is the opportunity to acquire land in large tracts at acreage prices, to be held by the city until park development is needed.

In response to Mr. Edward Heiselberg's questions, Mrs. Whitnall indicated that these lot fees are put into a special fund, administered by the Park and Recreation Commission. Title to the land is obtained by actual deed transfer to the city. Mr. Wesson Cook inquired whether the fee method had been tested in court. Mrs. Whitnall replied that no court case had arisen.

Mr. Wood discussed the dedication technique of acquiring open space from developers. He cautioned planners that the percentage indiscriminate use basis could result in recreation areas too small for efficient use and costly to maintain. He recommended that dedicated areas from

contiguous subdivisions be taken at the corners and merged to form a park or playground of sufficient size. A minimum standard for dedication should be $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres per subdivision.

Mr. Dill said that Baltimore County makes joint use of small neighborhood parks by combining them with school sites: 20 acres for elementary school centers, and 30 to 50 acres for junior and senior high school sites. He recommended storm drainage reservations as an effective tool for the preservation of open spaces in subdivisions because the taking of such land is based upon a demonstrable principle.

Mr. Shurtleff emphasized two major planning principles involved in open space preservation: First, that an integrated master plan is needed before standards can be set. Second, that the right to subdivide is a *privilege*. In requesting this privilege, the developer is producing a burden on the government to provide additional services. The best police power is reasonability. Thus, if the reservations, dedications or fees which the community might demand as the price of the privilege of subdivision are reasonable, then such restrictions should hold in court. However, the city must have specific statutory authority for whichever method is employed.

OPEN SPACES AROUND DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

Mr. Nolen pointed out that new modes of transport have created a new mobility of labor, thereby changing the location pattern of industry in metropolitan areas. With the resulting suburbanization of industry, it is most important to relate these plants to the overall master plan, and to establish requirements to protect the neighborhood. He cited the ASPO bulletin on performance standards as an invaluable guide to planners. He urged caution in admitting industry into residential zone. Even though light industry might have no nuisance characteristics in terms of noise, dust, smoke, odor or traffic, the psychological aspect might have a deteriorating effect on the neighborhood.

Mr. Dill described an M-R zone (restricted manufacturing) in the Baltimore County ordinance, which provided for open space around industrial plants by permitting only 25 percent occupancy of the site.

Mrs. Muncy pointed out that modern industrial plants are providing open space on their sites. Most new laboratories and factories are handsomely landscaped with generous front and side setbacks. Their interest in aesthetics is an aid to community and employee relations. Landscaping, however, also serves to absorb sound, and is further evidence of industry's continuing efforts to be a "good neighbor." Recreation areas are provided by many companies. Baseball diamonds, soft ball fields, and picnic areas are often located on the plant site. Parks are being developed on the grounds of larger plants. The outstanding example is the arboretum which General Electric has planted at Appliance

Park, Louisville, Kentucky. Company engineers are proud of the fact that the park is not fenced but completely open to public use.

Mr. Shurtleff reminded planners that while zoning can require certain distances to be maintained between industrial structures and residential areas, it is the enlightened attitude of industry which will provide most of the open spaces around new industrial plants.

RURAL ZONING AND DENSITY DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. Dill cited the example of conservancy zoning in Waukesha County, Wisconsin, as a means of preserving land in rural areas for agricultural and recreational use only. Residential, commercial and industrial uses are prohibited. The effort to restrict density in Baltimore County by an R-120 zone, with a minimum of approximately $2\frac{3}{4}$ acres was not successful, primarily because citizens considered the restriction a serious deterrent in disposing of their property. The County, however, had an ample instrument to discourage premature development in the requirement for a paved street.

Professor Charles Eliot said that the highest use in rural zoning may not be residential, but agricultural or recreational. He recommended that planners combine efforts with agricultural economists to determine the size of economic unit suitable for several types of rural land uses. He warned that acreage zoning may be considered class zoning by the courts, with the danger of segregation by income.

Mr. McClain said that the Pittsburgh area is considering a minimum of 60,000 square feet when public water and sewage services are not available, to be automatically reduced to 30,000 square feet when these services are provided.

Mr. Albert Walker, campus planner for the University of California, reported that Santa Clara County has developed a zone for exclusive agricultural use.

Professor Eliot pointed out that a key to the retention of land in agricultural use is the policy of the tax assessor. Mr. Shurtleff claimed that, although he has been emphasizing for more than 20 years, after the land has been rezoned, it should be reassessed; few have heeded.

Mrs. Whitnall also stressed the importance of keeping the assessment low on agricultural land. She further cautioned planners against too stringent controls to retain land in agricultural land use. In one California area, if 15 percent of the owners petition for agricultural zoning, the Planning Commission is required to so zone it, and keep it in that use for 15 years. Unless 80 percent of the owners agree to change the agricultural zoning, this land use is reimposed for another 15 years. Thirty years is too long a time to require a land owner to hold his land in agricultural use if subdivisions are being built adjacent to his property.

A suggestion was offered that land capability studies be made prior to rural zoning.

HIGHWAY ZONING

A highlight of the zoning round table sessions was Mrs. Whitnall's explanation of a new technique in zoning, which can also be applied to controlling land uses along highways. On the zoning map, the potential classification of an area should be indicated, in addition to the present use classification. The potential use should be arrived at by planners after careful research and field study. Thus four corners of a future highway intersection might now be zoned residential, but a potential for future commercial use would also be noted on the zoning map, based upon recognition of the suitability of the location for that future use. The land owners would be guided and forewarned by this planning forecast future use. To translate this potential use classification to a permitted use, a precise detailed plan must be adopted, constituting an amendment to the zoning map. Such precise plan must indicate exact boundaries, design and dimensions of streets, parking areas, building sites and similar features.

Land use in a reclassified precise plan is limited exclusively to such uses as are permitted in the zone to which it is classified. "Uses shown on the precise plan including automobile parking shall conform to such precise plan even though such uses are not otherwise specifically classified by the ordinance as permissible in any given zone."

Mrs. Whitnall said that this zoning by design has eliminated commercial string development in the areas where it is in effect. In response to a query about its usefulness when the ownership is split, Mrs. Whitnall replied that all owners must work together and approach the Planning Commission for a unified plan in order actually to obtain the zoning classification now indicated as potential.

Mr. Shurtleff asked why a specific potential should be noted on the map. Would it not be sufficient just to indicate that another use might develop later? Mrs. Whitnall replied that some property owners might early pressure for a revision to an incorrect use. The potential use recommended by the planner is based upon careful research. She indicated that the assessors are not yet reassessing the property in terms of the potential use.

Professor Eliot asked if all four corners of a highway intersection should be reclassified as commercial. Mrs. Whitnall said that the planners were unable to determine which side of the highway might first develop commercially, so felt it best to indicate the potential of the area.

In reply to a query of Mr. Robinson, of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning Council, Mrs. Whitnall said that the potential classification method of zoning had not been tested in the courts.

Mr. Shurtleff concluded the sessions with a suggestion that a separate highway zone, possibly in control of the State, might be set aside—say approximately 1,000 feet from the center line on each side. By using this device of designating potential uses, we could control all the uses

along the highway—and with one fell swoop, get rid of the clutter, billboards plus, along the highway. Sadly he destroyed this dream by reminding planners that the State had delegated its authority for land use control, and that every community along the right of way of the new highways would protest.

Conference Conclusions

TOM WALLACE, Louisville, Kentucky, Chairman

IN 1955 the American Planning and Civic Association, acting with the American Institute of Park Executives, the Council of Metropolitan Regional Organizations, the National Recreation Association and the National Conference on State Parks called a Citizens Conference to consider current pressing problems presented by the unprecedented growth of population which gave the United States an estimated 168,000,000 people January 1, 1955, with predictions of 290,000,000 at the century's end.

People crowding into national parks from growing urban areas at the rate of 50,000,000 a year find facilities designed a generation ago for less than one tenth of that number. There is a clear responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to see that the American people, who own the national parks, are provided with adequate facilities when they visit the national parks.

We are beginning to create effective machinery for planning and administering metropolitan districts which often stretch into two or more States, comprise all or parts of numerous counties and include many closely settled communities operating under separate governments.

One of the most important elements in a metropolitan plan is adequate provision for parks, playgrounds and open spaces.

In the nineties the Boston Metropolitan Park Commission began to build the Metropolitan Park System. And yet today historic Boston Common, reserved in 1634, is threatened by a proposed vast underground parking garage. In other cities parks are menaced by expressways and unrelated buildings because they are unwisely considered free land. There are in the 48 States historic sites and state parks numbering nearly 2,000 and totaling nearly 5,000,000 acres, visited annually by 166,000,000 people.

The challenge of the second half of the Twentieth Century is to evaluate our park and wilderness heritage and to provide and protect at each level of government the spaces our growing population needs to maintain gracious living and for the physical and mental welfare of our people.

Parks of every classification, including conspicuously national parks and municipal parks in major cities because of the public's waxing demands upon their services are threatened with loss or impairment of

natural characteristics for which they were preserved. For example, there is a grave erosion problem in New York's famous Central Park, because that park is not now nearly large enough to serve its area.

Yet opportunists, holding office in various units of government, and shortsighted, influential individuals and organizations outside government, obstinately consider reservations as free land when they plan roads or other needed improvements not more vitally important than the reservations they would damage or destroy.

Recognizing these facts numerous well versed citizens, nationally known as being interested in preserving suitable spaces for the present and future generations assembled in Washington, aware of unceasing efforts of unsleeping forces to diminish and to denature reserves which have great intangible values. In most cases we find greater dollar values than the land would have in any other use than that to which it was dedicated.

That a more or less permanent record of conclusions of the conference might be made a Committee on Conference Conclusions was formed. It was divided into three parts, a Metropolitan Sub-Committee, a State-Action Sub-Committee and a National Parks and National Reservations Sub-Committee.

Members of each Sub-Committee were invited to submit to the chairman of the Committee on Conference Conclusions suggestions upon which a report might be based. Not all of them responded, but numerous suggestions were made. It was decided to form from those suggestions and from utterances by participants in the program a text which would summarize the conclusions of the conference.

The Conference's conclusions were and the considered opinion of the participants is that:

(1) There are not too many parks and open spaces. In number and in total area they are inadequate rather than more than adequate for the services which the foreseeable population of the United States will inevitably and quite reasonably demand.

(2) There are examples of reservations not wisely chosen, but they are exceptions to the rule that wisdom and foresight characterized action of those who figured as creators or promoters of open spaces.

(3) The history of parks which have been preserved, despite many efforts to curtail them—notably the history of Central Park in New York, continued existence of which as a park is creditable to the culture of our greatest city—shows the wisdom and the public service of those who created them and of those who have effectively opposed their curtailment.

(4) In a democracy such as ours, eternal vigilance is the price of everything that is desirable. No law that protects public reservations is sufficient in itself to serve as perpetual protection. Unless those—always, and naturally, a minority—who understand their value, are

continuously militant in their behalf, laws protecting them will be over-ridden or changed by legislative action.

It is necessary that courts of last resort be aware of the dangers to public welfare, that lie in leniency toward those who would take for other uses, well chosen reserves and thoughtfully preserved open spaces.

(5) There is, ineluctably, a clash of purposes in the development of any vigorous Nation. Those who would build a highway, or a high dam, which would damage a public reservation are not necessarily inferior mentally or morally to those who would preserve a reservation that reflects the wisdom and foresight of other citizens. But the temptation into which exponents of industrial development, highway development, even development of education, may be led are great. Reservations that were wisely made never will have too many defenders.

Among suggestions made by members of the committee which, it seemed to the chairman, should be incorporated in the text of the conclusions of the conference, because they agreed with statements made and approved during the conference are these:

All parks and comparable reservations should be effectively protected from curtailment, transformation or destruction by units of government seeking to use them as "free land".

Courts of last resort should recognize the fact that to dispossess the public of spaces dedicated to the public in perpetuity, because a highway commission, an educational institution or an industrial enterprise may desire to use the areas, is unethical and destructive.

Builders and creators of subdivisions should be required to reserve a suitable portion of their developments for parks and recreation or contribute to a fund to provide adequate and suitably located open space in accordance with accepted standards.

A good public park is an attractive and well maintained outdoor public area in which people of all ages can enjoy themselves, can be inspired, and can learn. Every effort should be made to improve the quality and diversity of park and recreation activities through a broad educational program to every man, woman, and child in the area.

The intangible values of Nature fire our emotions, influence our happiness and contentment, and make life worth living. The naturalistic setting is vital to the development of sound cultural, sociological, and spiritual values. As our Nation progresses to larger urban areas, it is necessary that man have available a place of natural beauty where the quiet inspiration of a secluded grove creates a new vigor of mind, spirit, and body. The conservation of natural areas, especially in the midst of metropolitan districts, and their use for recreation is an important factor in the conservation of human ability and the development of the true American way of life.

Every national and local conservation organization should be militant, as a defender of existing reserves. In view of a foreseeable

population of 300,000,000 in the United States, every citizen should be a zealous advocate of more and greater reservations.

More expansion, bigger budgets, bigger staffs, should be the battle cry of park administrators. Add to the words of Robert Moses; "mean parks make mean people" the equally true assertion "good parks make good citizens".

As a major objective, making reservations self supporting is not advisable. This practice leads to a catchpenny outlook on the part of park supervisors and a tendency toward commercialization which may defeat the purposes for which parks are established.

Developments within parks that are designed to attract tourists and conventions for purposes not primarily connected with proper enjoyment of parks, constitutes commercialization and may lead to impairment of the park's values as well as to unwarranted competition with private enterprise.

Where fragile (destroyable) assets are concerned, the limiting and regulating the public's visiting is warrantable and even commendable, and should appeal to well versed students of conservation problems.

Sound policies governing administration and use of parks, are based upon the concept that superb natural scenes shall remain unimpaired through the coming centuries of our culture. Our national parks and state wilderness parks are not resorts for superficial recreation and entertainment. No developments or activities that impair natural scenes should be encouraged in wild reservations. Intrusion of the artificial is undesirable and may become ultimately, destructive.

For the usefulness and success of reserves it is essential that we have adequate laws, qualified administrative personnel, programs of education or interpretation, including year-round services of park naturalists, proper maintenance, proper planning to eliminate temptations to misuse park areas.

Fifty years ago park management was widely looked upon as mainly care-taking. Along with growing recognition of needs of open spaces of several classifications has come recognized need of adequately trained administrators employing adequately trained staff members, in parks for perpetuation of opportunity for recreation, as well as in forests which are planned for production of timber, protection of watersheds, conservation of ground water and for other purposes, including recreation.

That parks are essential in a rightly ordered civilization is increasingly understood. They are much more than mere playgrounds. They affect health and culture. As community property, state property or national property they should be owned as definitely as factory sites or home sites are owned by individuals. Unlike residence sites and factory sites, they create and preserve desirable neighborhoods; which are protected, by their existence, from blight.

It is the responsibility of city, metropolitan-area, state and national planning agencies, in cooperation with recreation officials, to recommend acquisition programs that will guard the population against lack of suitably chosen and rightly administered open spaces in the future. It is important to insure an adequate and balanced park system in advance of land settlement, to preserve natural stream valleys and provide for the welfare and happiness of future generations, as well as to preserve property values.

Growing pressure for use of park areas for highways, housing, armories, universities, civic centers, libraries, auditoriums, schools, hospitals, parking spaces and other purposes should awaken the public to the fact that virtually all communities, all States and the Nation, need more spaces than they now have, and that sound planning for the future takes into consideration growth of population.

Existing parks were, as a rule, chosen because of especial suitability of the scene as the site of a park. Using part of a park, or all of a park as "free land" and providing equal acreage for park use is therefore usually unsound regardless of the fact that surrounding values are affected adversely when park land is yielded to industrial uses or to highway development.

A vigorous publicity campaign, in the press, if press support be available, and in opposition to the press if newspapers will not cooperate, will in many cases avert destructive encroachment.

For preservation of wilderness state parks which, without the safeguard, may be abused by "developers" each State might well establish a non-political advisory board similar to the Wisconsin Board for Preservation of Scientific Areas.

It should be always in the minds of advocates of preservation of spaces that no law and no code of ethics binds a court of last resort, but that public opinion may be effective. For protection of spaces but through the instrumentality of courts it is essential to develop public opinion in their behalf to the point at which it is recognized in courts, including last resort courts.

Hotels, lodges, cabins, restaurants and facilities for suitable types of recreation are widely considered essential to the greatest usefulness of wilderness state and national parks, but development of such facilities as ends in themselves, designed to attract tourists and conventions for purposes not primarily concerned with proper enjoyment of parks constitutes commercialization that may readily lead to impairment of the park's resources as well as to unwarranted competition with private enterprise.

Administrators of two nationally known and nationally important reservations, the Cook County Forest Preserve (Illinois) and Everglades National Park (Florida) do not permit hotels or lodges within their boundaries.

Horses used for riding within the Cook County Forest Preserve number about 1,700. They are owned and stabled outside the reservation.

What, in the future, may be prevailing policy with regard to overnight accommodations in parks remains to be seen, but a safe policy nowadays is to avoid permitting developments in and uses of parks that will or may destroy or impair qualities which occasioned their creation.

CITY AND METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS

It is the responsibility of city and metropolitan planning agencies (in cooperation with park and recreation officials) to recommend at intervals acquisition programs for parks, parkways and public open spaces which will extend 20 or 25 years into the future. Planning agencies should specify for guidance of administrative officials a schedule of capital expenditures which will ensure an adequate and balanced park system in advance of land settlement, in order to preserve natural stream valleys and provide for the population which is reasonably certain to be living in the area.

The coordination of neighborhood parks, play grounds and school sites is recommended to serve planned residential districts.

Service roads in urban parkways should be planned to give access to the parks and add to the enjoyment of park users.

While arterial highways and belt routes may very well be provided with divided lanes and pleasantly planted roadsides and some may be limited to passenger cars, there is no justification for incorporating park roads into regular routes for handling fast traffic into and out of urban centers.

It is held that the use of areas dedicated for park purposes should be limited to recognized park uses. The taking of park land, with or without compensation, for unrelated uses, is an evidence of poor planning to be avoided at all costs.

Express highways, parking of automobiles and other facilities for passenger and freight traffic should be financed from national, state and local gasoline taxes and special appropriations designated for such facilities, without the appropriation or diversion of existing park lands, already shown in most cities to be inadequate for present needs.

The use of parks as sites for unrelated public buildings, including fire houses, libraries and other municipal structures, should be forbidden in law and practice. Each type of public building should be financed with specific appropriations, without the free use of land acquired by the public for other purposes.

STATES

State parks, state historic sites, and related types of reservations have been established primarily to conserve and make available for

public enjoyment a variety of areas of scenic, scientific, and historic interest. They should be maintained to retain their intrinsic values to the greatest extent practicable. Only those recreation facilities and activities that are suitable to the character of the areas and do not conflict with their primary purpose should be permitted. Adverse uses such as hunting, logging, mining, grazing, highway rights-of-way, and sites for buildings not associated with park use, should be avoided. State recreation areas are in a different category and may permit a greater variety of recreation activities.

The States should be encouraged to develop adequate state park systems, state forests and wildlife areas, served with parkway connections for pleasure travel.

State legislatures are asked to provide effective controls of access and roadside use along the 41,000-mile Federal Aid Interstate Highway System which is being authorized by Congress, in order to protect the usefulness of the highways for moving traffic and prevent premature deterioration of these highways in which the public is investing huge sums of money.

NATIONAL

The Federal Government now owns outright a system of National Parks and Monuments which by Congressional mandate is directed to be preserved as nearly as possible in their natural condition, and specifically exempted from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission for the development of power by private companies. The enabling act creating the National Park Service and amendments, may be taken as Congressional protection of the entire system, but it may well be that Congress will some day enact overall legislation to protect national parks and monuments from public power projects. On the positive side, wilderness values in our national parks offer unmatched cultural assets to our people, and, before it is too late, a concerted effort should be made to bring into the system those remaining untouched areas which qualify as national parks.

The Federal Government, through the U. S. Forest Service, has set up in the National Forests, many wildlife areas. It may be that careful study will dictate revised boundary lines but when these are once determined it is to the public interest that they be recognized and maintained against all unrelated encroachments.

The U. S. Forest Service is also seeking the recognition of recreation as one of the major uses of national forests. With adequate appropriations these recreational facilities should add greatly to the enjoyment of the American people.

The Wildlife Refuges which have been established by the Federal Government or designated within existing Federal areas have provided for the protection of wildlife which is absolutely essential in a country

with a rapidly growing population which otherwise would extinguish or reduce many species now extant. These areas should be protected from all encroachments which limit their usefulness.

PARKWAYS

A study of various types of highways bearing the name of parkways or resembling parkways is recommended so that there may be differentiated:

1. Well laid-out contour highways, with landscaped roadsides, restricted to passenger cars, but serving to carry heavy streams of suburban traffic into and out of central business districts.
2. Pleasant highways, bordered by improved roadsides, provided for carrying heavy arterial traffic, even if restricted to passenger cars.
3. Highways and boulevards, well designed and flanked with planted roadside strips and supplied with divided lanes for truck as well as passenger traffic.
4. True parkways, with contour roads, wide protected roadsides, limited access, restricted speeds, planned only for pleasure travel.
5. Roads in established parks, designed to fit into the scene, to be used for access to and enjoyment of the park. The design and use of roads to carry traffic across a national, state or local park, should be discouraged as not in the public interest. In closely-built city areas, it may be necessary to provide traffic ways across large park areas, but these can be designed and planted so that they are little noticed and they can be provided with separate grade crossings in order to keep the park roads intact.

COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE CONCLUSIONS

Tom Wallace, Louisville, Kentucky, Chairman

Metropolitan Sub-Committee

- George E. Dickie, National Recreation Association, Washington, D.C.
 Garrett G. Eppley, Pres. Am. Institute of Park Executives, Bloomington, Ind.
 Miss Barbara Terrett, Council of Met. Regional Organizations, Washington, D. C.
 Perry L. Norton, Exec. Dir., Am. Institute of Planners, Cambridge, Mass.
 Milo F. Christiansen, Supt. of Recreation, Washington, D. C.

State Action Sub-Committee

- Sidney S. Kennedy, Chief Branch of State Cooperation, National Park Service, Washington, D. C.
 Burton W. Marsh, Dir. Traffic, Engineering and Safety Dept., Am. Automobile Assn., Washington, D. C.

- Ollie E. Fink, Exec. Secy., Friends of the Land, Zanesville, Ohio
 George B. Fell, Exec. Dir. Nature Conservancy, Washington, D. C.
 V. W. Flickinger, Chief, Div. of Parks, Dept. of Natural Resources,
 Columbus, O.
 H. S. Wagner, Director-Secretary, Akron Metropolitan Park District,
 Akron, O.

National Parks and Reservations Sub-Committee

- Fred M. Packard, Exec. Secy, National Parks Assn., Washington,
 D. C.
 Frederick L. Rath, Director, National Trust for Historic Preserva-
 tion, Washington, D. C.
 William Voigt, Jr., Exec. Dir., Izaak Walton League of Am., Chicago,
 Ill.
 Howard Zahnizer, Executive Secretary, The Wilderness Society,
 Washington, D. C.
 C. R. Gutermuth, Secy., North American Wildlife Foundation,
 Washington, D. C.
 John H. Baker, President, National Audubon Society

INDEX

- Albright, Horace M., 35.
 Allen, Ernest E., 81-82.
 Allen, Frederick Lewis, 166.
 American Automobile Assn., x, 103, 108, 111.
 American Inst. of Architects, 134.
 American Inst. of Park Executives, x, 134, 190.
 American Inst. of Planners, x, 134, 172.
 American Nature Assn., x.
 Am. Planning & Civic Assn., v, ix, 133, 137, 163, 190.
 Am. Recreation Society, x, 133, 135.
 Am. Society of Landscape Architects, x, 135.
 Angeles Crest Highway, 11.
 Appalachian Park Comm., 34.
 Appalachian Trail, 11, 34.
 Armstrong, C. H., 82-83.

 Baker, John H., 198.
 Beartooth Highway, 11.
 Beston, Henry, 57.
 Blakeman, T. Ledyard, 129-132.
 Blue Ridge National Parkway, 6, 35.
 Bluestone State Park, W. Va., 87.
 Boston Met. Parks, 165, 191.
 Bradford, C. P., 54-57.
 Broyhill, Rep. Joel T., Va., 184.
 Budget, Bureau of, 4.
 Bush, Donald, of Hare & Hare, 163.
Business Week Magazine, 118.
 Byrd, Sen. Harry F., Va., ix, 33-36.

 Calif. Assn. for Health Ed., etc., 135.
 Calif. Dept. Natural Resources, 135.
 Cammerer, Arno, 35.
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore, 6.
 Carter Caves State Park, Ky., 66.
 Cascade Crest, 11.
 Catalina Mountain Highway, 11.
 Central Park, New York, 174-179.
 Christiansen, Milo F., 133-137, 155-156, 197.
 Churchill, Winston, 111.
 Cincinnati Development Committee, 144, 148.
 Cincinnati Met. Master Plan, 146.
 Civil Aeronautics Admn., 3.
 Clark, Mrs. LeRoy, 138.
 Clarke, Gilmore D., 123-129.
 Clay, Grady, 139-144, 173.
 Colorado River Storage Project, 39, 40.
 Commerce, Dept. of, 8, 14, 118.
 Committee for Economic Development, 118.
 Constable, Stuart, 174-179.
 Cook, Wesson, 186.
 Cook Co. Forest Preserves, 165, 194, 195.
 Coolidge, President Calvin, 182.
 Cotter, William H. Jr., 84-85.
 Cougill, K. R., 63-65.

 Deep Creek Lake State Park, Md., 70.
 Delano, Frederic A., 181.

 Devil's Lake State Park, Wis., 54.
 Dickie, George, 167, 197.
 Diggs, Col. John C., Nat. Park Serv., 85.
 Dill, Malcolm, 186-190.
 Dinosaur National Monument, 39.
 Drury, Newton B., 35, 60.
 Dyer, Harold J., 68-69.

 Eckhart, Fred D., 76.
 Edward Douglass White Mem. Park, La., 68.
 Edwards, Guy, Supt. Shenandoah Nat. Park, 36.
 Eisenbeis, Roland F., 165-170.
 Eliot, Prof. Charles, 188, 189.
 Elk Neck State Park, Md., 70.
 Emmert, J., Supt. Glacier Nat. Park, 36.
 Eppley, Garrett G., 197.
 Evans, James F., 77-78.
 Everglades National Park, 5, 195.

 Falls State Park and Rec. Area, Md., 70.
 Fatig, Dr. Richard S., 81.
 Federal Reserve, 118.
 Feiss, Carl, 157-162, 172.
 Fell, George B., 198.
 Fink, Ollie, 198.
 Finley, Dr. David E., 181, 182.
 Fish and Wildlife Service, 28.
 Flickinger, V. W., ix, 79-81, 90-96, 198.
 Forest Preserve Dist., Cook Co., Ill., 165-170, 194, 195.
Fortune Magazine, 118.
 Freeman, Carl A., 76-77.
 Friends of the Land, x, 198.
 Fuller, Lonnie C., Texas, 85.

 Gabrielson, Dr. Ira, ix, 24.
 General Butler State Park, Ky., 66.
 General Electric Co., 187.
 Glacier National Park, 35.
 Grant, U. S. 3d, v, 181.
 Great Lakes Park Training Inst., 64.
 Great Smoky Mts. National Park, 6, 35.
 Green Mt. National Forest, 46, 50.
 Gregg, William C., 34.
 Gutermuth, C. R., 31, 198.
 Gutheim, Frederick, 138.

 Hanson, Earl P., 59-61.
 Harper's Ferry National Monument, 70.
Harper's Magazine, 166.
 Harr, H. M., W. Va., 87.
 Harrington, C. L., 53-54, 88-89.
 Harris, Mrs. Ethel, 85.
 Hay, William M., 63.
 Hayward, George C., 144-150.
 Hebert, Herbert, 41-45.
 Heiselberg, Edward, 186.
 Hella, U. V., 72-73.
 Hettrick, John T., 176-179.
 Hill, Elmer C., 62.
 Hjelte, George, 135.
 Honeyman, Jessie M. State Park, Ore., 83.

Hoover, President Herbert, 34, 125, 182.
Housing and Home Finance Agency, 170.
Houston, Austin, 74.
Howard, Ebenezer, 159.
Howsley, Andrew M., Texas, 85.
Humbug State Park, Ore., 83.
Huron-Clinton Met. Auth., 131, 165, 166.
Huttleston, L. L., 51-52.

Ickes, Harold, Secy. of Interior, 35.
Independence Hall, Pa., 84.
Izaak Walton League, x.

Jackson, J. B., 144.
James, Harlan, x, 1, 163.
Jeffers, Charles, 163.
Johnson, Flinton G., 67.

Kauffman, Rudolph, II, 180-186.
Kaylor, Joseph F., 57, 69-70.
Kelsey, Harlan, 34.
Kennedy, Sidney S., 197.
Kenney, Raymond J., 70-71.
Kentucky, Dam Village State Park, 6.
Knight, Gov. Goodwin J., 59.

Lake Bistineau State Park, La., 68.
Latham, Mrs. Maude Morse, N. C., 78.
L'Enfant Plan, 123, 160.
Leopold, Aldo, 30.
Levin, David R., ix, 97-102, 111.
Lewis, Jack L., 30.
Lieber, Col. Richard, 95.
Lynn, David, 181, 182.

McArdle, Richard, Chief Forester, ix, 8.
McClain, James, 150-154.
McKay, Douglas, Secy. of Interior, 31-32.
Mann, Roberts, 96.
Mansfield Battle Park, La., 68.
Marsh, Burton W., ix, 103-109, 197.
Mather, Stephen T., 34.
Matthews, Donald C., 61.
Mellon, Andrew, 181, 182.
Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 28.
Mission 66, National Park Service, 4, 38.
Moll, W. P., 83-84.
Mont Chateau State Park, W. Va., 87.
Moore, Charles, 181.
Morrill, John Barstow, 163.
Morse, Thos. W., 78-79, 112.
Moses, Robert, 174-179.
Mt. Shasta Road, 11.
Mt. Mitchell State Park, N. C., 78.
Muir, John, 30, 51, 56.
Muncy, Dr. Dorothy A., 186-190.
Myles Standish State Forest, Mass., 71.

Nat. Assn. of Travel Organizations, x.
National Audubon Society, x.
National Capital Planning Comm., 124, 126.
National Capital Parks, 124, 126, 127, 128.
National Conference on State Parks, vi, ix, x, 41-89, 190.
National Forests, 8-14, 46-50, 196.
National Municipal Review, 146.
National Parks, 31, 32, 33-36, 37-40, 196.
National Park Service, 1-8, 12, 64, 71, 119, 124, 128.
National Parks Assn., x, 30, 198.
National Recreation Assn., x, 114, 135, 190.

National Trust for Historic Preservation, x.
Nature Conservancy, x.
Neuse State Park, N. C., 78.
Neuberger, Sen. Richard, 107.
New York *Herald Tribune*, 119.
New York Walk Book, 122.
Nolen, John, Jr., 186-190.
North American Wildlife Foundation, x.
Norton, C. McKim, 120.
Norton, Perry L., 172-173, 197.
Noyes, Theodore W., 129.

Olmsted, Frederick Law, 174.
Oregon Skyline Trail, 11.
Oppermann, Paul, 135.
Otter Creek Park, Ky., 67.

Packard, Fred M., 30, 198.
Palisades Interstate Park Comm., 139.
Parsons, Samuel, 174.
Patapsco State Park, Md., 70.
Patterson, Bradley H. Jr., 32.
Pen-Mar State Park, Md., 70.
Pikes Peak Highway, 11.
Pinchot, Gifford, 46.
Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle, 151.
Point State Park, Pa., 152.
Pollock, George, 33, 34.
Prendergast, Joseph, 114-119.
Public Roads, Bureau of, 97.

Quinn, Frank D., 85.

Randall, Dr. Josephine, 135.
Rath, Frederick L., 198.
Rathfon, Richard, 137.
Robinson, Charles, 189.
Roberts, Ashley C., 74-75.
Rock Creek Park, Washington, 161.
Rockefeller, Nelson, 176.
Rogers, John I., 52-53.
Roosevelt, President Franklin D., 34, 35.
Roosevelt, President Theodore, 36.
Root, Elihu, 129.
Root, Irving C., 105, 106.
Rush, Wilbur A., 65.

Sam Houston State Park, La., 68.
Saturday Evening Post, 28, 71.
Saylor, Rep. John F., ix, 37-40.
Sebago Lake State Park, Me., 55.
Segoe, Ladislav, 130.
Segrest, James L., 58.
Shearer, Gordon K., 85.
Shenandoah National Park, 6, 33, 34.
Shoreline, Our Vanishing, 7.
Shurtleff, Flavel, 186-190.
Sierra Trail, 11.
Simon, Robert G., Vt., 86.
Simon, Louis A., 181.
Skyline Drive, 11.
Skyland, Va., 33.
Smith, Col. Glenn, 34.
Smoot, Senator Reed, 181.

Taft, President William Howard, 124.
Temple, H. W., Rep., 34.
Terrett, Barbara, 197.
Thoreau, Henry, 30.
Tilden, Freeman, 55.
Tobey, Russell B., 75-76.
Tryon Palace, N. C., 78.

Tudor, Ralph, Under Secy. of Interior, 28.
Turner, Maurice E., Texas, 85.
Twentieth Century Fund, 119.

University of Calif. Dept. City and Regional Planning, 135.
University of Minn. Museum of Natural History, 73.

Vanderzicht, John R., 86-87.
Vaux, Calvert, 174.
Virgin Island National Park, 6, 7.
Voight, Wm. J., 198.
Von Brook, Walter, 30.
Von Nerta, George A., 181.
Von Storch, Earl, 170-171.

Wagner, H. S., 198.
Walker, Albert, 188.
Wallace, Tom, 190-198.

Ward, Henry, 66.
Welch, Major William A., 34.
Wells, William W., 67-68.
Wetmore, James A., 181.
Wheeler, Gerald S., 46-50.
White Mountain National Forest, 46-50.
Whitnall, Mrs. Brysis, 186-190.
Whittemore, Prof. H. O., 149, 162-165.
Wilderness, 14-23.
Wilderness Society, x, 14.
Wild Life Management Institute, x.
Wildlife Resources, 24-31, 196.
Winans, Sterling, 133-137.
Wirth, Conrad L., ix, 1, 33, 35, 55, 71, 119.
Wood, Garland, 186-190.
Work, Hubert, Secy. of Int., 34.
Wye Mill State Park, Md., 70.

Yellowstone National Park, 38.

Zahnizer, Howard, ix, 11, 14-23, 30, 198.

